THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

It was inevitable that Dr. William Temple's contribution to philosophy and theology should be expounded and valued, and we have a really satisfactory judgment given us by those entirely competent to do this in *William Temple : An Estimate and Appreciation.*[1] There are six writers who tell us of various aspects of Dr. Temple's public life and work, as a Bishop, as a Church reformer, as a social thinker, as a great figure in the Oecumenical Movement, and as a man. But most readers will be attracted by the first essay on 'William Temple as Thinker,' by Dr. W. R. Matthews, which is a masterly performance.

Dr. Matthews draws attention to three qualities in his subject that are outstanding. One is his intellectual fecundity. He has left an array of books that would be a more than respectable harvest for the lifetime of a man who had nothing to do but think and write. But these books were written in the intervals of leisure which were always brief and display an amazing energy which for many years flowed like a strong, still current. They were of two kinds, the few (probably three) weighty and deeply meditated books and those of a popular kind, written *currente calamo*. The latter were of great value for they spread an understanding of the meaning of Christianity among multitudes of bewildered people. But Dr. Matthews concentrates on the few more elaborate volumes in which Dr. Temple's convictions are systematically stated.

The second characteristic was Dr. Temple's prodigious memory, a gift very rare among those given to abstract thought. He had at his command, not only the arguments and trains of thought of the great philosophers, but also the words they employed. Doubtless his great fertility was due partly to this capacity; while other men laboriously accumulated notes and references he could draw upon the knowledge stored in his mind.

A further and important characteristic of Dr. Temple was that he possessed a believing mind. By temperament he was the opposite of a sceptic. He said once that he had never for one moment doubted the divinity of Christ—'surely,' says Dr. Matthews, 'a revealing statement.' 'I believe it to be simply true,' he goes on, 'that he had never had to face as a personal problem the ultimate doubts . . . we feel as we read that Temple simply could not understand a state of mind for which everything is doubtful. This naturally positive and "believing" quality is reflected in his writings. When we read some authors, such as Von Hügel, we are conscious of a sense of tension; behind the rugged sentences there is a struggle against ever-present questioning: the faith has been wrought out with hard wrestling. When we read Temple we . . . are dimly aware that the main conclusions in his mind have always been unshaken.' These conclusions were, as Temple himself said, the 'response of his whole being' to truth.

When we study Dr. Temple's greatest works, for example the Gifford Lectures on 'Nature, Man and God,' we observe, to begin with, that he was a 'realist.' He begins where common sense begins by assuming that the material world is prior to the mental. 'The dominating fact in the new situation may be stated thus: the world as apprehended is now something that antedates apprehension.' He is prepared to admit that there is unbroken continuity in evolution, that the passage of inanimate to life, consciousness and self-consciousness, involves no break.

But the main point in Dr. Temple's 'case' rests upon the 'emergence' of mind. Mind and

[1] James Clarke; 7s. 6d. net.

its activities cannot be explained by any purely materialist hypothesis. To give any coherent account of the nature of living organism we must postulate the dominance of mind. And any deep consideration of this fact must be fatal to a materialist philosophy. But any philosophy which (like Temple's), starting from the facts of the evolving world, dwells upon the emergence of mind as the clue to the nature of the process is in danger of leading to an exclusively immanent conception of the divine. Temple, however, firmly maintains the affirmation of Christian theism which requires that God should be thought of as both immanent and transcendent.

It is interesting to observe the theological interpretation which Dr. Temple makes of his philosophical theism. In the following words he 'put the point (as he himself says) in the traditional terms of Christian theology.' 'God as immanent is the Eternal Logos, the personal expression of the divine character, thought and purpose; this Logos is the explanation of all things that occur whether it be the regular and customary growth of the seed into the plant, or the birth of his own fleshly tabernacle from a Virgin Mother; neither of these is more divine than the other; neither represents a divine intrusion from without; each is a manifestation of divine activity appropriate to the occasion. But in the variety of activity there is no instability or incoherence, if only because the personal Logos does nothing of Himself but in all things expresses the transcendent God.'

We can see how Temple's conception of Revelation follows from his teaching on the divine immanence. Evidently, says Dr. MATTHEWS, anyone who takes immanence seriously must contemplate all creation in the light of Revelation. Dr. Temple does not hesitate to draw this conclusion. 'Unless all existence is a medium of revelation no particular revelation is possible.' Dr. Temple held that the essence of Revelation is the self-disclosure of God in human experience, and that Revelation is apprehended by faith, which is not the assent to correct doctrines but personal fellowship with the living God.

Thus it is misleading to suggest that doctrines have the authority of the Holy Spirit except in a secondary and derivative sense. 'Doctrine is of an importance too great to be exaggerated,' he writes, 'but its place is secondary, not primary. I do not believe in any creed, but I use certain creeds to express, to conserve and to deepen my belief in God. What is offered to man's apprehension in any specific revelation is not truth concerning God but the living God Himself.'

We must pass over Dr. MATTHEWS' close analysis of the Archbishop's teaching on the relation of human freedom to divine omnipotence and omniscience, though for the sheer interest of it, we must quote the startling words Temple uses about the use of man's freedom in sinning. 'It is true to say that God so made the world that man was likely to sin, and the dawn of moral self-consciousness was likely to be more of a "fall" than of an ascent. Human sin was not a necessary episode in the divine plan, but was always so closely implicated in the divine plan that it must be held to fall within the divine purpose.'

At the close of his absorbing survey of Dr. Temple's teaching Dr. MATTHEWS asks if there is any central thought or vision which permeates the whole of his thinking. He believes there is. In the Preface to his Gifford Lectures Dr. Temple tells us that he had thought of calling his book 'A Sacramental Universe,' and Dr. MATTHEWS thinks there could not be a better description of his vision of Reality. To him all existence appeared to comprise various levels or grades of being, each of which, below the highest, found its interpretation and its unity in that which was above it: matter in life, life in mind, and mind in spirit. The whole is an order, in which, through all the orders of existence and their processes, spirit is manifested and expressed. To have stated this sacramental conception of the universe so massively and in such detail is a great achievement and a great service to his generation.

But thought has already moved somewhat from Dr. Temple. Many of the questions which Temple regarded as central have ceased to be the chief subject of debate. He has to some extent fallen out of fashion. We are now, says Dr. MATTHEWS, confronted with two widely different but very confident groups, one of which dismisses the philosophy of religion as of no value for Christian theology, while the other maintains that Thomas Aquinas has found all the answers. Temple had small sympathy with either of them. This phase will pass. We shall return to the direct attack on the great problems. And then Dr. Temple's attitude and grasp of truth will prove invaluable.

We have become aware in the last few years, as, perhaps, never before, of the emergence of two new world edifices, the Great Society and the Great Church. They have not yet by any means fully arrived but they are definitely on the way

and visible to the eyes not of those only who dream. Talk of a world-state is not to-day dismissed as fantastic, as it was yesterday, and, as for the world Church, it begins positively to loom in some of its actual outlines from among the mists of 'our unhappy divisions.' The world's fears, centring on the atom bomb, are driving men toward the former; their deepening sense of failure to fulfil the purpose of God is slowly drawing Christian people toward the latter. The hope of the City of God that used to gleam like a grain of salt, far off and fleeting, has drawn nearer to us and shines more steadily. Now that we can look back at the nineteenth century and assess its missionary achievement, we can call it, in spite of its many grievous shortcomings—as Professor Latourette calls it—'the Great Century,' 'the age,' as he says, 'when Christianity for the first time in its history . . . became a world-wide movement which reached every continent and almost every people and language.'

The recent publication by the International Missionary Council of a 'Study in the World Mission of Christianity'—*New Buildings on Old Foundations* [1]—by J. Merle Davis comes most opportunely to remind us of the new responsibilities and demands that the opening of this new stage in the Church's history lays upon us. This book is one of several reminders that have come to us in recent months of the changed aspect of things that is opening before us as Christians, and of the need that we should address ourselves to consideration of what it requires of us. Latourette's great 'History of the Expansion of Christianity,' now completed by the appearance of its seventh volume, is another witness to the significance of the present time when one Christian epoch is ending and another opening. Thus in a striking review of Latourette's History the 'Times Literary Supplement' in a recent issue pointed out that 'the great missionary expansion of the nineteenth century was everywhere based on the principle of immediate conversion,' but that now we must think more, as Latourette says, not of the Christian community but of the *Corpus Christi*. And if that is the case, then the fragmentation within the Christian Church must end.

The leaders of the churches, with the Archbishop of Canterbury at their head, are realizing that resolute efforts are required for the promotion of Christian union. Twenty years ago Bishop Palmer who, as Bishop of Bombay, had a great part in the promotion—now approaching accomplishment—of South Indian Union, was fully aware that he and his friends were working for what he hailed in his book, 'The Great Church Awakes.' The hopes and fears that have gathered round that project are surely prophetic of what the present hour so greatly needs and what is slowly drawing nearer. 'It seems indeed,' the commentator in the 'Times Literary Supplement' affirms, 'as though the sectarian principle had worked itself out and a new form of ecclesiastical unity was being gradually built up.'

[1] Cloth, 8s. 6d.; paper, 6s.

Such movements toward union may well create new courage and hope in those who are working for the advancement of the missionary enterprise and who now see it in its allotted place in the descent of the new earth out of heaven from God. 'One World,' said Mr. Wendell Willkie, and therefore also we can say, 'One Church.' That must be a main aim in the policy of the Christian Church and in its missionary purpose for this new age. There are many other changes—only secondary to this primary one—that will be required and that must be studied by those who are guiding the churches. They will find much to help them in Mr. Merle Davis's book. He calls it *New Buildings on Old Foundations* and adds that it is 'a handbook on stabilizing the younger churches in their environment.' It is not built upon theories of the Church but mainly upon practical experience—an experience remarkably wide in its scope—and upon the lessons that the varied fields of missionary service all over the world can teach us.

Mr. Davis sets out to show how the 'new buildings' of the Young Churches can most wisely be built on the foundation on which the churches of the older tradition rest; or, to express this aim otherwise, how these new churches can be rightly adjusted to the environment in which they live and on which they largely depend. Being a product of the United States, Mr. Davis never fails to be concrete and practical in his approach to the problems he has to deal with. In this respect his guidance is particularly valuable to those who, further East, are strong in theory but very apt to fail to carry their theory to its practical consequences. Thus he is more apt to speak of 'techniques' of working than of the theology that these techniques must serve, but all the time he is mindful of the ultimate purpose that has to be served. He does not discuss what the 'old foundations' of the new buildings are, and it may be difficult to determine sometimes what the exact boundaries of these foundations should be. At the same time his guidance is firm and sure in

regard to the necessity of preserving all that is good in every old culture that the missionary seeks to transform. And to that end it is required of the missionary, as he says, that 'in addition to preaching the Gospel, he should take the slower step of discovering the needs, values and aspirations of the people which their culture endeavours to satisfy,' and so should present Christianity as 'a fulfilment of their own culture.'

On this important subject—of the separation of the precious from the vile in non-Christian cultures—Mr. DAVIS is a wise guide and his advice should be studied and followed by every missionary. He gives an amusing example of what he calls 'perverted missionary conceptions of the rôle of the Church in relation to native usages.' In the Belgian Congo a tribe had a tradition that the washing of clothes should be the work of the men. But the missionaries, to correct that error, 'earnestly taught and demonstrated that laundering in a Christian household should be done by the women.' It is not always as easy as it is in this case to see where to draw the line between the essential and the inessential and something more than a sense of humour is needed for our guidance. Mr. DAVIS shows us the right way to take and it is, as he says, 'a delicate and costly process.' 'The Christian mission should face these life patterns reverently and try to discover the foundation stones and main beams in the *mores* of the people which have made them Asiatic or African rather than Anglo-Saxon or European, and, wherever possible, build them into the structure whose corner-stone is Christ.'

Mr. DAVIS urges the value of the anthropological approach as a means of gaining insight into the culture not only of primitive peoples but of the advanced races of India and China as well. This is a subject that was dealt with by Dr. Kraemer in his important book, 'The Christian Message in a non-Christian World.' Dr. Kraemer's approach is that of the Central European theologian and as such it differs in some respects from that of Mr. DAVIS. At the same time they are in large agreement as to 'the indigenization' of Christianity in the thought-forms of non-Christian peoples. Dr. Kraemer, it will be remembered, rejects peremptorily 'the so-called sympathetic approach of tracing similarities and trying to build bridges.' It is very doubtful if Dr. Kraemer would go as far as Professor Hocking, whom Mr. DAVIS quotes, when he says, 'If a new idea is to take sturdy root it should make a maximum use of whatever kindred ideas have been there before.' Dr. Kraemer would probably omit the word maximum, and he adds as a qualification in this connexion—'so long as the impelling and primary motive is to express the Gospel and its invariable essence.' Mr. DAVIS would, I am sure, say the same, but where to fix the limit of such indigenization must always require much wisdom and Christian insight on the part of the missionary. As to where that '*horos*,' that dividing line is to be fixed the American Christian and the Dutch Christian may not always agree.

Such a question does not arise here. Mr. DAVIS, as we have seen, is more at home in questions of Christian practice than in questions of Christian theology, though we may be quite confident that the foundations on which he seeks to build the young churches are sure and steadfast. He gives much of his attention to the economic environment of these churches and the means by which they can reach financial independence and so may become virile and self-respecting communities. On this subject he has much shrewd advice to give for the economic strengthening of churches which are in the main made up of people who are far from being rich in this world's goods. From the little Chinese girl who can stand up in front of the hens that the Sunday School's gifts of eggs have produced and say, 'I am the Lord's hen-keeper,' and the Angola plan for 'itinerant missionary hogs' upwards Mr. DAVIS assembles projects by which, in every quarter of the missionary world, self support is being achieved. They are cheering examples of Christian ardour and Christian ingenuity and should provoke us of the wealthier West to a similar faithfulness in our stewardship.

Mr. DAVIS's book is full of interest and inspiration. The Church of Christ, which is coming into its inheritance, whether it be in the lands that have had Christianity for centuries or in those where it is a new thing waiting to be explored, is growing into a single living Body. 'The modern world,' Mr. DAVIS says, 'will be saved together or lost together.' The missionary entrusted with the proclamation of the Christian message will henceforward be at work within an immensely wide field of reference. He belongs to Humanity and to the Church which is the *Corpus Christi*. He must divest himself of all narrow nationalism or denominationalism if he is to be worthy of his calling as a builder of the City of God, that City which is a building not of man but of God, the great Master Builder—which is 'built to music, therefore never built at all and therefore built for ever.'

Towards the Conversion of England.

Modern Agencies of Propaganda.

By the Reverend C. B. Mortlock, M.A., F.S.A., Epping, Essex.

It is a misfortune that the honest word 'propaganda' should have fallen into disrepute. From signifying an evangelical responsibility in the care and oversight and sound teaching of the overseas mission of the Roman Catholic church it has been so debased as to serve as a synonym for tendencious falsehood.

We shun the use of the word—though the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts has not sought to change its name!—and, what is more, are inclined to be half-hearted about propaganda however named. No section of the Report of the Commission on Evangelism, on which I had the honour of serving, has been so much criticized as that headed 'Modern Agencies of Propaganda.'[1] There is a widely held and deeply rooted notion that there is something unseemly about making use of the means which the contemporary world affords for influencing the lives of our fellow-citizens. None will question the assertion of the Commission that the main influences in the lives of our people in their patently mechanistic environment, and largely affecting their attitude to religion and the Church, are secular. If that be conceded it follows that a growth of secularism is inescapable unless we use those media which mould men's convictions. Is it seriously to be contended that the Church must not use such powerful means of propaganda as the cinema, radio, television, the newspaper press, the drama, and the highly specialized technique of the advertising expert because they savour of vulgarity?

If the Church is to reach the common people it must use all ways of approach which the common people understand. That does not mean that the Church is to play down or cheapen the gospel, but rather that in using modern agencies of propaganda it will employ them at their best and so turn them to God's glory. Anything short of the best available is, I admit, likely to be damaging. One can see that in the travesties of the art of the cinema which the clergy are invited to use as religious films. On the other hand, there are conspicuous examples of another modern technique of propaganda, that of the radio, being used superlatively in the service of religion. Foremost of such examples is that of Miss Sayers' play, *The Man Born to be King*, which judged by any standards was an outstanding achievement. In the last year there have been signs that the theatre is turning to spiritual themes. One illustration will suffice, namely that of *This Way to the Tomb*, which has just ended a run of over three hundred performances in the west-end of London. In this play by Ronald Duncan, with music by Benjamin Britten, the beholder was offered a richly satisfying experience in which exaltation and amusement sprang directly out of satire. The important thing to note about this play and others of similar genre, such as Eliot's *Murder in the Cathedral* and Anne Ridler's *The Shadow Factory*, is that they were staged by commercial managements for the attraction of the ordinary playgoer.

Though the radio has been used to religious ends in a way which leaves no possible room for suggesting that on any ground, technical or artistic, religious broadcasting is inferior to secular broadcasting, it must be remembered that it can never provide a substitute for worship as musical broadcasting provides a substitute for concert-going—if, indeed, any true music-lover will admit that possibility.

When we consider the powerful influence on the people of this country exerted day in day out by cinema, radio, and press we ought also to consider whether our Lord and His Apostles would have disdained their use had they been available to them. Some ten years ago, at a meeting at Leeds, Lady Bridgeman startled a sedate audience of Church people by remarking—I have not her exact words—that since our Lord did not disdain publicity He would presumably have used the newspaper press had it been in existence, or would, at least, have encouraged His disciples to do so. One can imagine the superb use St. Paul would have made of the *Corinthian Courier* or the *Philippian Post* had such organs of public opinion been in existence. He would have got the new religion, not himself, discussed in their columns and he would not have minded overmuch whether it were praised or condemned so long as it was not ignored. Every reader would have known not only that a vital principle was at stake, but also what that principle was.

The difficulties in the way of an official body of

[1] *Towards the Conversion of England*, 101 ff.

the Church Assembly launching out into Christian propaganda are considerable, since official utterances have to be nicely balanced. But it should not be impossible to enlist the help of men and women writers who already have the ear of the press and public. There are many more writers than is always realized among the laity of the Church, and by that, of course, I mean writers of note. Their churchmanship may not ordinarily come out in their literary work, but it would be surprising if a good proportion of them were unwilling to use their talents from time to time in the service of religion.

I called attention to this largely untapped course of persuasive power some years before the war, but little has been done to draw on it for the work of the Church as a whole. Our Roman Catholic brethren have a lesson to teach us in this matter of utilizing the literary talents of their adherents. The Roman Catholic writer and journalist can rarely, if ever, complain of lack of encouragement. And the ordinary journalist, likewise, knows that he can count on the fullest possible help from the authorities of the Roman Catholic Church in building up a good news story. I understand that part of the memorial in London to the late Cardinal Hinsley is to be a house in Westminster catering specially for the needs of newspaper correspondents.

The Church of England has its Church Press Bureau, but it is sadly hampered for want of adequate staff and equipment. The wonder is that so lamentably stinted of the necessary tools it does the job so well. But the Press Bureau is open only at the usual office hours of nine to five, and is closed for four or five days at a stretch at such times as Easter and Christmas. Lambeth Palace, the headquarters of the Archbishop of Canterbury, is without any organized press or public relations service. It quite often happens that a news editor or a journalist making a telephone inquiry finds a housekeeper, but no one else, at the other end of the line.

In the last year a beginning has been made in the holding of Press Conferences on matters of outstanding religious interest. These have been arranged for the most part by the Church Press Bureau. Many people experienced in such means of communication think that they might be more frequent. One of the reasons, perhaps the principal reason, why obviously ill-informed allusions to the Church appear in the press is that the Church is unwilling to take the newspapers into its confidence. In all other departments of public life the press is furnished with full ' background ' material. Much of it is confidential and not for publication but it enables a newspaper writer to comment intelligently on the news which *may* be printed. All through the war journalists were daily in possession of military secrets, but they are scarcely ever trusted with ecclesiastical secrets. The result is that on occasions of important news breaking they are in a most disadvantageous position.

Individual clergymen and church organizations have a—to the journalist—maddening way of becoming importantly uncommunicative when events of unusual public interest are imminent.

There is no question that religious topics are of interest to a very large number of newspaper readers. Editors would not maintain religious features if they did not satisfy an ascertained demand. Religious articles have appeared regularly for a great many years every Saturday in such national dailies as *The Times*, *The Daily Telegraph*, *Manchester Guardian*, and *The Evening News*. Other smaller newspapers have found it worth while to provide similar features. An example of what the Church can do to assist in such popularizing of Christian truth is provided by the successful experiment launched in 1936 in the Diocese of Salisbury. As the result of a more or less informal meeting between members of the diocesan publicity committee and editors of county newspapers a scheme of newspaper evangelism was inaugurated and has continued ever since to great advantage. Six of the principal newspapers circulating in the counties of Wilts and Dorset have co-operated week by week in the publication of short religious articles of from five to six hundred words. The articles are supplied by a team of thirteen contributors appointed by the Bishop. From the beginning the Archdeacon of Sarum has managed the scheme. To him the contributors send their MS. and he sees that it reaches the editors on the due date. Punctuality of delivery is of the essence of the scheme's success. Recently the scheme has been extended at the request of the editors concerned to papers in the adjoining county of Somerset. All the articles are anonymous ; they strive to be evangelistic, and to deal with practical applications of the Faith. The writers are urged to be very simple in style and language and to remember that they are not addressing church people only.

A section of *Towards the Conversion of England*, dealing with the possibilities of paid advertising in newspapers, has aroused misgivings. The Church in this as in other matters tends to cautious conservatism. But it is worth remembering that the Church was early to see the immense possibilities of Caxton's invention of printing with movable types. From the beginning the art of printing has been used in the service of religion. A foremost exponent of the desirability of the Church entering the advertising field is Mr. F. R. Sainty, a well-

known advertising consultant who gave evidence before the Commission. Much that follows embodies his views, but before considering the case for newspaper advertising it is worth while bearing in mind that the newspaper advertisement is the old-fashioned tract in an up-to-date form. The tract was pressed into the hands of any who would receive it. The advertisement space in the newspaper and magazine goes into the home and is seen and read by any who will spare a moment.

Not so very long ago the advertising columns of the press were used solely for commercial purposes and charitable appeals, but during the war a movement which began earlier showed how they could be used by the Government to achieve an end that could scarcely have been achieved in any other way. The Government recognized in the newspaper advertisement one of the most powerful of all forms of the art of persuasion.

A notable example of the use of newspaper advertising for other than commercial purposes was that adopted during the war by the Ministries of Health and Food. The Ministry of Food retained the goodwill of the people, despite all its ineptitudes, largely by reason of the brilliant use of newspaper advertising. The Ministry of Health likewise resorted to the advertising columns for the prosecution of its campaign against venereal disease.

The popular newspapers, weekly, daily, and Sunday, together with all general periodicals and magazines, have a combined circulation in Britain of many millions of copies. For example, one day's issue of all the dailies, together with one week's issue of all the weeklies and one month's issue of all the monthlies amounts to more than sixty million copies. This great circulation of periodicals day by day, week by week, and month by month among a gross population of forty-five million, or a reading public of perhaps thirty million represents an average of two copies of everything published as newspaper and magazine for every man, woman, and adolescent.

No writer of feature articles, however popular, can command more than a very small part of such a circulation for his writing. Even groups of newspapers could not syndicate special articles in more than a small fraction of this great circulation of sixty million. Yet the Ministry of Food can ensure the publication of its message regularly and accurately in every single copy.

I stress the word 'accurately.' The message is word-perfect: exactly that in presentation, phraseology and emphasis that its sponsors intend. As the Report of the Commission on Evangelism puts it: 'While news columns open but once to a story, and even then usually not as completely as desired, reiteration of a carefully prepared message is possible in the advertisement columns.' And: 'Only by saying over and over again what it is desired the public should grasp, can there be any confidence that the message is finding its mark.' [1]

Everybody has some experience of the power of the written word and its repetition. We may remember reading a passage at a minor crisis with a conviction that it hit the nail on the head—was just what we needed at the time. History and biography are full of instances of men being turned from their course and converted to God by the written word. If space permitted I could cite many striking examples which are before me as I write.

What is the claim of newspaper advertising to be used in the service of religion? It is that such advertising permits of the preparation of a series of special messages, and the publication of the series exactly as and when desired; and their publication over and over again if need be. The aim of such newspaper publicity should be to carry the reader along a clear-cut line of thought. The advertisements should be linked with posters, films, pamphlets, and radio broadcasts; all organized to the same end.

But, it may be asked, what is the end to be served by this powerful aid to evangelism? The answer is: The preparation of the soil. Human hearts hunger and thirst for God as the earth hungers and thirsts for sun and rain. To quote the Report again:

'Dr. J. W. Welch, the Director of Religious Broadcasting of the B.B.C., has recently alluded to the "spiritual hunger of the people." He said: "There are millions of people who are not attached to any religious body but who habitually, day by day, listen to religious broadcasts and hold sincere Christian convictions. . . . Your eyes would be opened if you saw the mail week by week, and read some of the letters from lonely, spiritually starved people whose souls have been quickened by what has been said on the radio, and who have been out of touch with religion for many years."' [2]

A similar hunger is disclosed in the letters received by writers of religious articles in the press. One such has had more than 25,000 letters from readers of his articles in the last twenty years. Another has built up a league of prayer numbering more than half a million men and women. Commercial advertisers experience the same sort of response to their offers of help in press advertisements.

The astonishing extent to which we are a newspaper-reading people was illustrated by the Report published in September by Sir Walter Layton, Chairman of the Rationing Committee of the Newsprint Supply Company. In this docu-

[1] *Ib.*, 115. [2] *Ib.*, 116.

ment, which was entitled *Newsprint: A Problem for Democracy*, Sir Walter says, 'Politically speaking, newsprint is the most vital product in the world. Most people recognize that the printed word can mould our lives, influence our environment and change the course of history.' He gives figures to show the rise in newspaper circulation from pre-war figures to those in May of this year. The total sale of morning newspapers rose from 12 to 16 million a day; evenings from 7 to 9 million, and Sunday newspapers from 16 to 25 million. There has since been a further large expansion of sales when they became unrestricted at the end of September. Total figures are not available at the time of writing, but there is no doubt that they will prove to be substantially greater than any before recorded.

To give some idea of the importance great publishing houses attach to supplying the public with enough to read daily, Sir Walter says: 'The long-range programme which the industry has put forward aims at reaching an eight-page basis in 1948 and a twelve-page basis five years after the end of the war, in 1950.'

Let me add here another quotation from the Report on Evangelism: 'In the advertisement columns of the Press we have a vehicle for a modern form of tract. By it a message can be carried into almost every household over and over again, and in ways whereby the millions of readers must eventually see it and grasp something of its meaning.' [1]

After the preparation of the soil, comes the sowing of the seed that is the work of the Church and the pastor. And that is true whatever the medium of public communication may be. It is certainly true of the radio though that is the one field of contemporary media of propaganda in which religion has been at no disadvantage. Since 1933 the Church has been inside Broadcasting House. Two priests of the Church of England, men of outstanding ability and character, have held the post of Director of Religious Broadcasting. Dr. Iremonger, now Dean of Lichfield, was succeeded in 1939 by Dr. James W. Welch under whose ægis religion has been accorded more time than ever before.

The announcement of Dr. Welch's impending retirement which is to take effect at the end of this present year has been received with something approaching dismay not only by churchmen but also by all who realize how much the presentation of the Christian religion on the air owes to the devotion and brilliant gifts of the present Director.

Dr. Welch has not only discharged his responsibilities at Broadcasting House with exemplary efficiency and zeal, but he has also given time and thought to making known to church people up and down the country the aims and methods of religious broadcasting by the B.B.C. He is, of course, the first to admit that the firm stamp of religion was first imprinted on British Broadcasting by the first General Manager, Mr. (now Lord) Reith. From the outset it had in that respect a character unlike that of any other broadcasting system in any other country of the world.

Half the Diocesan Conferences in England must have heard Dr. Welch talk of his work. And an enthralling story it is, as he unfolds it, with the fires of conviction and devotion burnishing his words.

Again and again Dr. Welch has asserted that the imperative need of the Church is to communicate its message. 'Communicate or perish' has been a sort of slogan reiterated in his speeches. Unless the Church is prepared to use the great modern media of communication it cannot, in his opinion, effectively reach the seventy per cent. of people outside our churches. The only one of those media which has been used effectively by the Church is radio. It is true that if the Church had had its way in the early days of broadcasting it would have effectively excluded itself altogether. There was immense opposition to the proposal to broadcast a religious service and it was due to the fearless independence of the Rev. H. R. L. Sheppard, then Vicar of St. Martin-in-the-Fields, that a religious broadcast was made from a church. For a long time clergy and ministers tended to regard the radio as a rival, and there were many to affirm the self-evident fact that since worship is a corporate act it can never find a substitute in broadcasting. Dr. Welch has shown that broadcasting so far from being in competition with the churches and chapels is their partner and ally. 'Apart,' he wrote recently, 'from taking Christian worship and Christian instruction to those who cannot or will not attend a place of worship, and apart from the special work which religious broadcasting can do by the annihilation of space, it seems certain that many practising members of religious bodies will look to the churches to supplement their present worship and instruction in church by a proper use of the microphone to enrich their conceptions of worship and to enlarge their knowledge of Christian truth.'

Radio of itself cannot become a converting power, but it can do much to prepare the ground, to stir a first interest, to prompt a first questioning of self, to awaken the human spirit to a realization of its need of God.

Dr. Welch speaks of the Church taking this—and other great media of communication—and 'baptizing' them, but he does not think that radio can ever take the place of the parish priest in his

[1] *Ib.*, 117.

pastoral activities, or the Confessional. Rather if the radio is to be used properly we must realize that there are certain things it can do and certain things it cannot do. Its main target is those who could attend a place of worship but do not or will not. Every morning as many people listen to 'Lift up your hearts' as attend all the places of worship put together on a typical Sunday morning.

The whole purpose of the work of the religious broadcasting department would, in Dr. Welch's opinion, be misunderstood unless it were realized quite clearly that what it is trying to do is not to give the listener in this country what he ought to get in a place of worship, and must get better there than through broadcasting because of the elements which cannot be broadcast. 'The purpose of religious broadcasting is,' he says, 'to make Britain a more Christian country.' Its purpose is not to offer Church services of a particular type—Anglican, Baptist, and so on; it is not to supplant, but to supplement.

Speaking last year to delegates of the Dominions Broadcasting Conference, Dr. Welch declared the first purpose of B.B.C. religious broadcasting to be evangelistic and missionary.

At present 5¼ per cent. of the Home programme is devoted to religious broadcasting, that is to say about six hours a week. It is handled by a department the director of which is a priest of the Church of England. The assistant director is a Methodist minister. These two are assisted by three Anglican priests, a Congregationalist minister and a Roman Catholic layman, with religious broadcasting assistants in some of the regions. They are servants of the B.B.C. appointed for the express purpose of broadcasting the Christian faith. In the use of none other of the modern methods of communication and propaganda is the Church so favourably placed.

Literature.

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

The Church of England in the Twentieth Century, vol. I., by the Rev. Roger Lloyd, Canon of Winchester (Longmans; 15s. net), is a book that will interest many outside the Anglican Church, for it is practically the story of religion in England, and it deals with events and personalities that influenced all the churches. It is a delightful and engrossing narrative, with all the attractiveness of such a book as Bishop Hensley Henson's reminiscences. Its author is just as prejudiced as the Bishop, and much more violent in the expression of his partialities and antipathies. But whatever your party colour may be, there is hardly a page in Canon Lloyd's book that is not worth reading. There is a great deal of hard thinking as well as hard hitting here, and many readers will find themselves in definite disagreement with the author in his estimate of persons and even of Movements. His opinion of Darwell Stone is an example of the former, and his almost completely favourable judgment of the Anglo-Catholic party of the latter.

Canon Lloyd is so far a man of his time that he believes in the unity of the Church. He recognizes that the two obstacles in the way to this desirable end are Modernism and Anglo-Catholicism. As to the former he thinks that it was Schweitzer who gave it its death-blow. Schweitzer did not succeed in imposing his eschatological Christ on the Church, but at any rate he did succeed, Canon Lloyd thinks, in showing that the Liberal Christ was an impossible conception. I am not sure that this is right. Thought has turned away from Schweitzer but it has left the Modernist standpoint very much where it was for good or ill. Sanday, Streeter, and Inge are not so easily disposed of. It is, however, true that there is a widespread impression that Modernism does not have, and cannot present, the gospel of the Incarnation and the Cross.

Canon Lloyd's judgment on the Anglo-Catholic Movement is almost wholly favourable. Its critics are roughly handled, more particularly those who might be regarded as outsiders. The twin villains in this company were Queen Victoria and Punch!, and the Canon indulges in almost violent vituperation against the old Queen. One wonders why Canon Lloyd is outside the party, his praise of it and his agreement with its standpoint are so whole-hearted. This appreciative judgment has, however, one great advantage. We get a really understanding and sympathetic account of one of the powerful Movements in Church life of the twentieth century by one who, if not inside it, is sufficiently near to be not far from the Kingdom.

These two Movements dominate this stage of the history, and they engross much of the author's space and of his vigorous exposition. There is a good deal more in the book than that, and it is all interesting. And we shall look forward to a second volume with lively expectation.

F. J. Rae.

RAMON LULL.

Professor E. Allison Peers keeps increasing the debt we owe him for his invaluable studies of the Spanish Mystics. The list of his books is now a lengthy one. And it is not easy to determine whether we are more indebted to him for his

voluminous translations of Santa Teresa and Father John, and Blanquerna, or for his original studies, written with such mastery and knowledge, and in the spirit that is likeliest to get through to the truth. It was Ludwig, not without distinction as a biographer, who set it down that 'if you are to make a subject live you must live with him, think with him, eat with him. Unless you have a certain passionate relationship to your subject you can never make him live to other minds.'

Professor Peers has so lived with those of whom he writes that the mists of time dissolve, and we see them and hear them, no longer fading figures on the tapestries of long ago, but living beings with whom we are face to face.

But, at a guess, I should surmise that for none of them has he himself a greater admiration and affection than for Ramon Lull. And, if it be so, is it any wonder? That strange, fascinating figure, with its colours far more vivid than they are in the most of us, who seem drably ordinary in his company; in some ways a true child and representative of an age, once real, but now far, far off indeed, so that the authentic records of this life sound to us to-day like sheer legend and romance; and yet in other ways so extraordinarily modern that even yet many of us still trail slow-footedly a long way behind him; this man with his august and daring dreams, which he would not allow to remain only dreams, but audaciously staked and lost everything in his attempts to translate them into actualities; with his arresting personality, and remarkable gifts, and far-seeing eyes, and something surely near to genius at the end of his pen—does he not loom up above the mass of men catching the eye, and storming the heart and the imagination?

In the hot, passionate days of the Crusades this son of chivalry, naturally fiery, kept proclaiming the futility of commending Christ to the Muhammadans by such crude and deadly methods, and went among them preaching our Lord by appealing to their reason and conscience and heart, sure that Christ's case had only to be stated to win its way into men's souls; and founded classes where others might be trained linguistically, and still more in spirit, to carry on such work. That surely is impressive. But even more is the depth of his devotion to his Master, which burns like an unwavering flame. And, for many, there is something singularly appealing in the quaint, mystical, imaginative way in which he sets that down. All this Professor Peers has shown to us in various books already. But here comes another—*Fool of Love: The Life of Ramon Lull* (S.C.M.; 6s. net), not so full as some of the others, yet fuller than any one else could make it, with which those who do not know Lull might begin, and feel a thrill that will impel them to go further.

A. J. Gossip.

THE INCARNATION.

The Rev. E. L. Mascall, Lecturer in Theology at Christ Church, Oxford, Priest of the Oratory of the Good Shepherd, made a name for himself in the theological world a year or two ago through his study in traditional theism entitled, 'He Who Is.' In a new book he passes after the manner of St. Thomas from natural to revealed theology, now offering his readers a study of the Incarnation and its consequences—*Christ, the Christian and the Church* (Longmans; 15s. net).

The book claims, as the author himself has expressed it, to exhibit the Incarnation as the foundation and the unifying principle of the life and thought of both the individual Christian and the Christian Church; whence the title. And the thread that unites the various ideas expounded is the doctrine of the permanence of the manhood of the glorified and ascended Christ, which is affirmed to be the central principle of Christian theology. In the light of this principle it is argued that many of the antitheses with which contemporary theology bristles are as a matter of fact false ones.

Obviously the author moves among high themes, such as the Liberal theologian hesitates to consider. As obviously he discusses them with ability and insight, such as the Liberal theologian is bound to respect.

A notable instance of his theological Conservatism is his maintenance, even as against the mild Liberalism of the Kenotic theories, of the old standpoint to be found in the Athanasian Creed, that the Incarnation involved the taking up of manhood into God and not the conversion of Godhead into flesh. But he is surely wrong in describing H. R. Mackintosh's Christology as that of a 'Kenotic extremist.' It appears to me that H. R. Mackintosh's theory of Kenosis at the Incarnation is not that of an actual abdication of relative attributes, whereby an essential change in the Divine nature would be involved, but—shall we call it?—that of a transposition or translation of relative attributes, whereby there would be involved a real, but non-essential, change in the Divine nature.

But I must not make too much of what is after all no more than an *obiter dictum* on Mr. Mascall's part. Rather would I call attention to his book as furnishing useful discussions from the orthodox or traditionalist standpoint not only of the Incarnation but of the Atonement, the Church, the Sacraments, Prayer, and other great themes of Christian theology.

The nature of theology is discussed in the closing chapter. To the question, What is the material on which theology has to work? the traditional answer is given that the raw material of theology is the supernatural revelation bestowed upon men through Christ and the Christian Church. But no attempt appears to be made to explain how this supernatural revelation is recognized to be supernatural revelation. The existence of natural theology, however, is not overlooked. But it is maintained, with M. Maritain and M. Gilson (with whose neo-Thomistic standpoint Mr. Mascall is in strong sympathy), that while in principle there is a certain limited knowledge of God accessible to the natural or rational man as such, in practice 'it is only in the light of revelation and under the

assistance of grace that the human reason can function adequately and can obtain, even within its own proper sphere, a knowledge of God which is free from error.' That accounts for the difference between the natural theology of an Aristotle and that of an Aquinas. Here, again, as it would appear, we must be content with affirmation rather than explanation.

As for the instrument by which the theologian is to work on his materials, it is not just his human reason, as the post-Thomistic scholastics and the Liberals declare, but (as Mr. Mascall claims) 'his whole self in its sacramental union with Christ in his Mystical Body.' 'In this,' as he adds, consistently enough, 'his rational powers, strengthened and illuminated by grace, will, of course, play an organic and prominent part.' In the position here outlined Mr. Mascall reaches the culminating point of his learned study and exposition, which is that the theologian, if he is to fulfil his task adequately, should be living in the Revelation itself, that is to say, in Christ and in the Church. With this, I take it, the Lutheran and Calvinist bodies would agree. If they do not lay the same stress as he does on the theologian's 'sacramental union' with Christ, they certainly stress the need of his 'moral union.' W. FULTON.

THE HOLY SPIRIT IN PURITANISM.

The seventeenth century provides a wealth of material with regard to many aspects of religion, amongst them the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, a doctrine which the Church has never been able to state with the care and completeness which circumstances have led it to give to some other points of dogma. The historical approach in *The Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and Experience*, by the Rev. Geoffrey F. Nuttall, D.D. (Blackwell; 15s. net), will serve a useful purpose in this connexion. Here we have both an erudite and an interesting study. The book contains much able discussion and many pertinent quotations, and is a genuine contribution to knowledge.

Puritanism is a word often carelessly applied; but the author makes plain that he uses it in the wider sense to include Separatism, and this is not only justifiable in itself, but is necessary for his thesis, since his interest is in the Puritans of the left, from amongst whom he rightly holds Quakerism in some sense emerged. Dr. Nuttall is well aware of the hostility between Quakerism and right wing (and even moderate) Puritanism, but states that much in Quakerism is a carrying forward of developments in radical Puritanism. This may be admitted; but I am tempted to suggest that those developments were developments away from Puritanism, and I am not inclined to accept his finding that early Quakerism 'indicates the *direction* of the Puritan movement as a whole,' any more than I would agree that Rationalism was the *direction* of Puritanism because such a tendency revealed itself in certain English Presbyterians and Scottish Moderates. It is like saying that Anabaptism indicates the *direction* of the Reformation. The Anabaptists thought so; but Luther, Zwingli and Calvin denied this violently. One must not confuse the forward direction of a Movement with its lateral developments: indeed, Movements generally tend to go over to their opposites laterally.

In view of the title, I feel that Quakerism plays a somewhat disproportionate part in the book. The author wisely relies much upon Baxter and Owen, and there are quotations from many other characteristic writers of the time; yet the range of reference may perhaps be thought somewhat limited, considering that a thesis is being maintained, and considering the enormous literature available, as evidenced, for example, by the McAlpin Collection in New York with its catalogue in five large volumes. This is of course a small book. It might be supplemented by such a study as Haller's 'Rise of Puritanism,' which from a somewhat different standpoint incidentally discusses the subject up to the very year in which George Fox left home. Treatment is confined to England, though two Scots writers are occasionally quoted. Should the T. H. Green reference on p. 62 not be to a private letter?

This is a book which not only draws together important information, but opens up quite a number of important questions that are worth pondering, and on which the author's opinions are of value. G. D. HENDERSON.

OUR THREATENED VALUES.

In *Our Threatened Values* (Gollancz; 5s. net) Mr. Victor Gollancz has no difficulty in demonstrating that indeed the traditional values of civilization are still in danger. He gives many examples that make painful reading of the disavowal of Christian ideas and motives in official and responsible pronouncements and of failure to live up to them in practical policies. He urges that the overthrow in war of enemies who had renounced belief in the supreme values of personality, of pity and decency and truth and freedom, does not mean that these values are now assured of dominance in the minds of the victors. The conflict brought them into peril everywhere and as Meredith says,

> when men the Fiend do fight,
> They conquer not upon such easy terms.
> Half serpent in the struggle grow these worms.

Reverence for these supreme values will revive and persist so that they are cherished by men and nations only if they are integrated with the religious faith in which they are rooted.

The matters, often highly controversial, in connexion with which Mr. Gollancz makes vigorous attacks on details of British policy and administration, lie rather outside the scope of discussion here. And already these pages would require re-writing to bring them up-to-date. In the many questions involving considerations of principle and expediency, idealism and a realistic estimate of the possibilities, his voice rings out with prophetic fervour disquieting to the easy conscience and complacent mind.

The book may provoke a comment or reflection that is no criticism. It will not be enough in the future any more than it has been in the past that these values be approved as the accepted ideology of reasonable liberal and Christian thought. They grew and cohered together as the result of Jesus' work and personality, as the convictions of men who were personally devoted to Him and found in His Passion the ground of faith and the motive to action. Their maintenance will require, as much as their establishment did, the operation of the Divine Spirit through men who own Jesus as Lord. Therefore the defence of our threatened values is finally and fundamentally in the proclamation of the Christian gospel.

R. W. Stewart.

In recent years Professor H. H. Rowley has been one of our most prolific writers on the Old Testament. As a rule his publications have dealt with special aspects of the subject, but in *The Re-Discovery of the Old Testament* (James Clarke ; 10s. 6d. net) he has given us a survey of the whole field. Many readers will find this one of the most useful books which has yet appeared from his pen —and that is saying a good deal. It covers archæology, history, and religion, including theology. Dr. Rowley, naturally, takes his own point of view, and in some cases argues freely against opinions which he rejects. But the latter are always fairly stated, and even readers who cannot share his conclusions will recognize the fact that these are based on an exhaustive study both of the ancient data and of modern discussion. The dedication to the late Dr. H. Wheeler Robinson is a fitting tribute to the greatest of scholars in the realm of Old Testament theology, and the whole book is transfused by Dr. Rowley's profound religious feeling and his conviction that the Old Testament reaches its fulfilment only in the Christian gospel. This is a book for which every serious student of Scripture will have abundant cause to be grateful.

Into the fight for faith, *Argument for Christianity*, by the Rev. John Kennedy, B.D., Ph.D. (Hodder & Stoughton ; 6s. net), drives like a cruiser tank firing wisecracks for armour-piercing shells. The first chapter on 'The Slide Towards Bestialism' sets out the familiar thesis that modern man in his pride has forgotten his dependence on Nature, on his neighbour and on God, losing the sense of mystery, believing in a progress that will give our children a lovely time in a Utopia controlled by an Executive armed with tommy-guns and systematized propaganda. The next expounds 'The Need of Democracy,' the essence of which is an understanding of the value of the individual, of man as an end in himself, a being realizing the absolute values of goodness, truth, and beauty which have their ground in God. This leads to a fine chapter on 'The Primacy of the Spiritual,' tracing the drabness of modern tendencies to the displacement of spiritual values. 'Man does not really believe in himself because he does not really believe in God. After chapters claiming that it is saints not scientists who are the experts in religious matters and discussing the revelation the saints receive, in particular through the self-disclosure of God in Jesus Christ, the book ends with a treatment of sin and salvation, maintaining that Christianity is the realistic attitude to the sum total of the facts of experience.

The author succeeds in his aim at pithy and arresting statement. It might be a criticism that at times the style takes charge of as well as expresses the thought. In his profound and suggestive meditation on Christ's Passion he perhaps omits something in not making explicit reference to the Cry of Dereliction.

The New Testament Letters (Oxford University Press ; 7s. 6d. net), by the Bishop of London, the Rt. Rev. J. W. C. Wand, D.D., was first published in Australia about three years ago. The preparation of a new edition for this country has made possible not only the correction of textual errors but a certain amount of revision. The aim of the book is to restore the habit of Bible reading, and this its author seeks to do by putting the Epistles 'into the sort of English which might have been used by a modern Bishop writing a monthly letter in his diocesan magazine.' Dr. Wand would not claim that he has succeeded in giving the substance of the Epistles in an altogether modern paraphrase (for we have here a paraphrase rather than a translation), but he has certainly succeeded in great measure, and his name and position will guarantee a wide use of the book. The usefulness of the book has been increased by the introductory notes, in which each of the Epistles is set in its historical frame ; also by the introductory rubrics. While it is quite easy to 'turn up' passages, the numbers of the chapters and verses are not obtruded.

The name of Professor C. C. Torrey on a book is a guarantee of work in which a high level of scholarship is combined with novel and challenging views. *The Apocryphal Literature* (Oxford University Press ; 20s. net) fulfils our expectations, though its divergences from normally accepted views are less sensational than those to be found in some of his work on the Hebrew Bible. The most obvious advance on his predecessors lies in his inclusion of the 'Pseudepigrapha' with the normal 'Apocrypha,' and while his reasons for this step will not convince all readers, they are cogently stated. Professor Torrey's views on the original languages of these books are well known ; he assigns to an Aramaic source several which others would trace to Hebrew. He gives a brief history of the Apocrypha (in his sense), and then offers a short Introduction to each book. While the new work is not so full or, it must be admitted, so useful as Dr. Oesterley's 'Introduction,' the two may profitably be read side by side. It is a little strange that Professor Torrey should completely ignore the English scholar ; the reason may be that the latter deals only with the books

included in the old Apocrypha, and recognized as canonical in the Catholic and Orthodox Churches.

Christian Worship: Its Making and Meaning (Religious Education Press; 3s. 6d. net), by the Rev. Horton Davies, M.A., B.D., D.Phil., a Congregational Minister, is a popular, though none the less reliable, introduction to its subject. In the first section an outline of the history of worship is given, beginning with a reference to the Jewish temple and synagogue and then passing to the various forms of Christian worship, in both East and West. In the second section the content of worship is set forth, with the aim and purpose of enabling the reader to take his part in worship with fuller understanding. In the third section the relation of worship to life is considered. The book is designed as a text-book for discussion among young people, and should admirably fulfil its design. The questions included in each chapter are drafted with great skill, and are well calculated to arouse interest in the subject.

The Rev. Stephen Pritt has set down in *Stumbling-Blocks* (Skeffington; 6s. net) many sensible, candid, possibly reckless, practical suggestions about the removal of hindrances to the work of the Church—inadequate training and pay of the clergy, ill-lit, ill-heated, uncomfortably and distastefully furnished churches, antiquated verbiage, refusal of evening Communion, celebration of marriage and baptism as social functions with no serious insistence on religious obligation being involved, the inclusion of very 'nominal' Christians in the electoral roll, the failure to reach re-union.

The kindly if tepid Foreword by his Bishop indicates the degree of interest such a book is likely to arouse in official circles.

A very thorough and able discussion of the relation of Christianity to practical political problems is given us in *The State as a Servant of God*, a Study of its Nature and Tasks, by the Rev. Philip S. Watson, M.A. (S.P.C.K.; 4s. net). Mr. Watson was at one time a Pacifist and has worked himself free from that position. It was in the course of this debate with himself that he came in sight of the larger problem of the Christian's relation to the State, which is the real subject of his book. Mr. Watson faces such questions as these: What is, or ought to be, the relationship between the State and the Church? Is religion a purely private affair? Are Christian principles valid only for private, and some other kind for public, life? And he discusses such subjects as the menace of State Sovereignty, the Authority of the State, the Limits of State Control, the State's Obligation towards the Church and the Church's Service to the State, the State in Christ's Day and in Ours, and, finally, the Sovereignty of Christ. The book is well-informed and at the present time of special interest and value, for the problems it faces are the problems that are raised by the events of our own time.

The Religious Value of Sacrifice.

By Professor H. H. Rowley, D.D., Manchester.

The apparently strong case which Dr. Cadoux builds up against me in his article in The Expository Times last month dissolves, on examination, into the claim that three Old Testament passages (Jer $7^{22f.}$, Mic 6^{8}, and Ps $51^{16f.}$) are to be rigorously pressed and then made regulative for the interpretation of other prophetic passages relating to sacrifice, while a sacrificial interpretation of the Cross is to be eliminated from the New Testament by dismissing the words spoken by our Lord at the Last Supper as 'problematical,' discounting Mk 10^{45} and any Pauline references to a sacrificial interpretation of the Cross as 'illustrative,' and treating the Epistle to the Hebrews as irrelevant to the study of New Testament teaching since it was 'long-unaccepted.' What is to be done with the Fourth Gospel, the Apocalypse and 1 Peter is not stated, but if I am left with these, I can still find a sacrificial interpretation in the New Testament. Lest these, too, should be excluded from the New Testament witness, however, I may observe that I have not claimed, and do not now claim, that a sacrificial interpretation of the Cross is to be found in an expurgated New Testament. I only claim that such an interpretation is found in the New Testament which has been accepted as canonical by the Christian Church, and the unbiassed reader may suspect that Dr. Cadoux also finds it there, since he is at pains to exclude or discount so much of its evidence. Dr. Cadoux adds 'So much for the charge of "parting company with the New Testament,"' and I can only echo his words.

So far as the Old Testament passages are concerned, while our interpretations differ we do seem to be playing on the same wicket, and I have some hope of persuading Dr. Cadoux to accept my view. He complains that I do not offer any adequate grounds for my assertion that it is quite incredible that Jeremiah should have meant to deny that

sacrifice had ever held any legitimate place in the religion of Yahwism, when he wrote Jer $7^{22f.}$, and he himself understands the passage to be an absolute repudiation of sacrifice as such, declaring that this interpretation is 'not contradicted by anything else he wrote, or by any other fact which we know about him.'

In the oldest of the sources of the Pentateuch sacrifice is declared to have been ordained and offered in the time of Moses, and of Samuel it is recorded in traditions which certainly far antedate Jeremiah's time that he offered sacrifice. Moreover, Jeremiah makes more than one reference to the deliverance from Egypt, which he clearly regards as the work of God. The only traditions of that deliverance we have associate it with a celebration of the Passover ordered by Moses in the name of God. I find it hard to believe that while Jeremiah accepted the deliverance as historical, he did not accept the offering of the Passover as historical,[1] and still harder to believe that Jeremiah regarded Moses or Samuel as impostors in ordaining or in offering sacrifice, since Jer 15^{1} is evidence of the high esteem in which he held them.

As evidence of Jeremiah's attitude to sacrifice I must leave out of account Jer 33^{11}, since many scholars doubt whether the words rendered 'of them that bring sacrifices of thanksgiving into the house of the Lord' are Jeremiah's. But it is not irrelevant to consider the evidence of Jer 7 as a whole, without confining ourselves to $7^{22f.}$. For there is no reason whatever to doubt that Jer 7^{1-15} is Jeremianic. There the prophet complains that the Temple has become a den of robbers, and predicts its destruction, which was to be as complete as that of Shiloh. But he does not base his case on the contention that sacrifice as such was displeasing to God, but on the declaration that the people steal, and murder, and commit adultery, and swear falsely, and refuse to hearken to the voice of God. Indeed, he says that if the people will hearken to God's voice, and amend their ways, the destruction of the Temple may be averted. This does not suggest that he is opposed to the cultus as such, but only to the cultus when it is an end in itself and divorced from obedience to the will of God in life.

The same conclusion emerges from the study of Jer $6^{19f.}$. There we read: 'Behold, I will bring evil upon this people, even the fruit of their thoughts, because they have not hearkened unto my words; and as for my law, they have rejected it. To what purpose cometh there to me frankincense from Sheba, and the sweet cane from a far country? your burnt offerings are not acceptable, nor your sacrifices pleasing unto me.' There is not the slightest reason here to suppose that Jeremiah is objecting to sacrifice as such. He is only declaring the futility of sacrifice that is offered by men who do not hearken to the Word of God. If his real meaning was that it would be just as futile if they did hearken to the Word of God, he was singularly inept in expressing his meaning. For in that case, the disobedience which was linked with the rejection of their sacrifices as the cause of that rejection was completely irrelevant to the matter.

It is not therefore wholly without reason, or without reference to any other teaching of Jeremiah's, that I understand Jer $7^{22f.}$ to mean that in Jeremiah's view God had never commanded mere sacrifices, sacrifices that were an end in themselves, and unrelated to the spirit of the worshipper. His primary demand was for obedience, without which the other was meaningless. Such a view harmonizes perfectly with the teaching of Jeremiah as a whole, and with prophetic teaching everywhere. If, on the other hand, the extreme view which Dr. Cadoux favours is first found in this Jeremianic passage, and then imposed on all the other prophetic passages relating to sacrifice, we are left to wonder why the compilers of Deuteronomy, who are generally held to have rested their work on the teachings of the eighth century prophets, enjoined sacrifice, and how the leaders of the Judaism that valued sacrifice came to collect and cherish the prophetic oracles.

Dr. Cadoux objects to my observation that 'when sacrifice has any meaning at all, it presents to God man's plea for help and equally the pledge of his willingness to receive it,' and declares that no such idea seems ever to have been expressed by later Jewish thinkers. I have elsewhere cited a number of passages which seem to support my contention.[2] Let one Biblical and one post-Biblical passage here suffice. In Lv $5^{5f.}$ we read: 'It shall be, when he shall be guilty in one of these things, that he shall confess that wherein he hath sinned: and he shall bring his forfeit unto the Lord for his sin which he hath sinned . . . and the priest shall make atonement for him as concerning his sin.' Here it is clearly taught that sacrifice has no meaning apart from the spirit in which it is offered. The same teaching stands in the Tosephta, Yoma 5^{9}, where we read: 'Sin-offering and guilt-offering and death and the Day of Atonement all put together do not effect atone-

[1] It is unnecessary to discuss here how far the Passover can rightly be called a sacrifice, since Dr. Cadoux holds that the prophetic reaction against sacrifice was due to their recognition of 'the inherent futility of killing a beast, hewing its carcase in pieces, tossing basinfuls of its blood in this place and that'—all of which applies equally to the Passover.

[2] *The Unity of the Old Testament*, 25 ff. (reprinted from *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, Feb., 1946).

ment without repentance.' As a mere external act, sacrifice cannot present to God man's plea or pledge; it is only when a man makes it more than a mere external act by bringing to it the spirit of obedience, and charging it himself with his plea and his pledge that it has validity.

I must deal more briefly with the other two passages cited by Dr. Cadoux. He claims that Mic 6^8 states the exhaustive demands of God, and that sacrifice is therefore excluded from the category of things well-pleasing to God. If this claim is justified, then the prophet must be held to have repudiated every form of corporate worship from the category of things well-pleasing to God. To treat his words thus in a literalistic and rigid way, as though they were part of an Act of Parliament to be interpreted in a Court of Law, seems to me quite inappropriate, and Dr. Cadoux is himself less literalistic in interpreting other passages of Scripture. When Jn 6^{27} says 'Work not for the meat which perisheth, but for the meat which abideth unto eternal life,' Dr. Cadoux does not say that labour for physical sustenance is excluded, but recognizes that the superior importance of the spirit is being stressed.[1] In this passage in Micah it seems to me more natural to understand the Prophet to mean that no sacrifices, however numerous or costly, can be well-pleasing to God so long as they are mere sacrifices. God's vital demand is in the realm of the spirit, and its acceptance must express itself in life. Here, as in all the prophetic passages, the essential meaning is closely similar to that which is expressed in 1 S 15^{22}: 'Hath the Lord as great delight in burnt offerings and sacrifices, as in obeying the voice of the Lord? Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams.'

Ps $51^{16f.}$ is a more difficult passage. I agree with Dr. Cadoux that the last two verses of the Psalm cannot be regarded as regulative for the interpretation of the verses that precede. I also agree that in the absence of our certain knowledge of anything else written by this Psalmist, we cannot exclude the possibility that he repudiated sacrifice as such, since these two verses, taken by themselves, could bear that meaning. But, if this Psalmist did so repudiate all sacrifice, we should not be justified in reading the same repudiation into passages in the Prophets, where we normally have more material on which to judge the writer's attitude. Nor can it be regarded as certain that this Psalmist did so repudiate all sacrifice. Dr. Cadoux has himself drawn attention to the Biblical 'use of an unreal negative to emphasize an important affirmative, *i.e.*, the use of "not," when what is really meant is "not only."'[2] He quotes a number of examples from the New Testament, and some from the Old. In the New Testament we find 'Whosoever receiveth me receiveth not me but him that sent me' (Mk 9^{37}); 'My teaching is not mine, but his that sent me' (Jn 7^{16}); while in the Old we find 'It was not you that sent me hither, but God' (Gn 45^8). In these and other cases the real meaning is not 'not this but that,' but 'not so much this as that.' In view of this characteristic idiom, therefore, we cannot exclude the possibility that the author of Ps $51^{16f.}$, when he said that what God desired was not sacrifice but a broken spirit, meant that God's demand was not so much for sacrifice as for a broken spirit, so that once more we have the thought of 1 S 15^{22} presented in more poignant form. Such is the view taken by Calès in his comment on the passage. He observes: 'A contrite heart and a sincerely humbled spirit are the true sacrifices of reparation and thanksgiving without which the external offerings and the slaughter of victims have never possessed any serious value.'[3] A passage which could, in accordance with well-established Hebrew idiom, be read thus cannot therefore with security be given the meaning which Dr. Cadoux here favours, and still less can be held to determine in that sense other passages, whose context of ideas in their author's teaching is against such a sense.

In his final paragraph, Dr. Cadoux says that 'to insist on the sacrificial idea as the key to the problem (*i.e.* of the Atonement) clearly involves the idea that Jesus' main work is to "represent" our penitence and faith to God.' I fear that Dr. Cadoux cannot have read my book very carefully, or he would have perceived that I insist that sacrifice must bear a two-way traffic or none at all, and that therefore Christ's Cross not alone becomes the organ of our approach in penitence and surrender to God, but also the supreme revelation of the love of God and the supreme organ of the power of God to re-create us in His image. To say that this is to make the 'main work' of Christ one side of this double process is a travesty of my argument.

From Dr. Cadoux I have learned so much over a period of more than thirty years that I am sorry now to find myself in disagreement with him. To be vanquished by him in debate would be a gain, for in the words of Cyprian 'non vincimur quando offeruntur nobis meliora, sed instruimur' (*Epist.* 71^3).[4] My regret is that I cannot feel that he has offered me that gain.

[1] Cf. THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, lii. [July 1941], 378.

[2] *Ib.*

[3] *Le livre des psaumes*, i. [1936], 517.

[4] Cf. Migne, *PL*, iv. [1891], 424.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Christmas in Prison.

By the Reverend R. W. Stewart, B.D., B.Sc., Killermont.

'But we see Jesus.'—He 2^9.

The writer of this Epistle to the Hebrews was very much aware of the sufferings even good people have to endure. The letter refers to 'spoiling of possessions,' to imprisonment, and to 'resisting unto blood.' It is not altogether a happy world in which we live, and we might be depressed. 'But,' this text says, pointing to the fact that is to banish every frightened or despondent feeling, 'But we see Jesus.'

A recent Report of the National Bible Society records a memorable incident that happened during the German occupation of the Netherlands, when hundreds of the finest people in Holland were thrown into prison in Scheveningen on the Dutch coast and kept there till they were killed. One was an agricultural student aged twenty-three, called Binnert de Beaufort. Thirty-six times he was tortured by the Gestapo, but would not betray his friends. Then he was sentenced to death, but was rescued from prison, and after his escape he wrote a little book about his prison life. Sad to say, soon after it was published he was detected by the Nazi police and shot while trying to escape again.

In that booklet he tells that just before Christmas in 1942, when he had been in solitary confinement for many weeks, a young labourer called Dirk from Rotterdam was thrust in beside him. On Christmas Eve they enjoyed a food parcel from the Red Cross, a great boon, for they were half starved. After they had eaten, Binnert got out his Bible and turned up the Christmas story in Luke about the birth of Jesus and the shepherds who heard the angels sing, and asked Dirk if he would like him to read it out. 'Yes,' said Dirk, 'we always read it at home on Christmas Eve.'

So he began to read, 'And it came to pass in those days . . .' when suddenly there came a voice from the next cell, 'Louder,' and then other voices from the cells along the corridor, 'Read so that we can all hear.'

Dirk took his stool and set it close to the door. 'Stand up on this,' he said, 'and speak through the grating of the ventilator.' So, in the dim light, standing on the stool and speaking through the iron grid above the door Binnert began to read as loud as he could, and in their separate cells down the passage the other prisoners listened. When the Christmas story was ended, he went on to preach. 'Have no fear,' he shouted, 'not even here in prison. "I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people."' Then he said the Lord's Prayer, and could hear the others joining in.

And that was not all. When he stepped down from the stool someone began to sing the carol, 'Silent night, Holy night.' The sound went through the prison, and away in the distance they could hear the women who were also condemned to death adding their clear voices to the music.

That is a strange and terrible and beautiful story of Christmas Eve in Holland only four years ago. We would like to be sure that such cruel oppression will never be known again. Yet though we are free and happy we all have our troubles and there are many things in the world to make people anxious and sorry. Even so, and even at the very worst the message of Christmas is that we ought to be brave and full of hope. For Jesus Christ came into this world beside us. He is still with us in all our trials. He makes us certain that God has a plan and purpose to save us from our sins and to receive us into His Kingdom. Many things may be hard and evil, 'but we see Jesus.'

Brighter Britain.

By the Reverend Charles M. Hepburn, B.D., Crieff.

'Be of good cheer.'—Ac 23^{11}.

Most of you will have heard of the B.B.C. But have you heard of the B.C.C.? I imagine it's not so likely. Nevertheless, these letters stand for an important body, namely, the British Colour Council. Its aim is to encourage employers in this country to make their works brighter and more attractive by carrying out different schemes of decoration. I read recently of one modern factory where interesting alterations were made. Instead of the machinery remaining as formerly, a dull metal colour, it was changed to a shade of fawn, the moving parts given a coat of pleasing green, while any specially dangerous ones were repainted red. One outcome was fewer accidents. Another, it was easier on the eyes of the workers. And, finally, the walls were painted pleasing colours too, which made the workers themselves cheerier.

I am sure most of us will agree we need more colour in various ways. In clothes, for instance. In a newspaper the other day it said that in the Strand one woman in three was wearing a coloured plastic raincoat or cape, which, the writer remarked, struck a cheery note on a very drab day. And, that men shouldn't be outdone, a wireless speaker the other night said that the latest fashion for men, just announced, was to be a jacket of one shade, trousers of another, and a patterned waist-

coat, perhaps with brass buttons. 'In fact, back to grandfather,' was how he put it. And possibly there was something to be said for grandfather's idea.

In outdoor things also I think we want a Brighter Britain. I still remember something I saw in the Rhineland, at the city of Coblenz through which the River Rhine flows. Standing on one bank I saw on the far side, shining in the setting sun, terraces of villas of various colours, one pink, another cream, another white, another purple, another rust, and so on; and it was simply beautiful, almost like a lovely rainbow. And in our own grey island, as in winter days it so often is, more such things as red roofs, white walls, colourful doors and windows, and so on would do a good deal to cheer us up.

And, come to think of it, the Creator splashed the world all over with wonderful colours. He might have made it all black or all brown. Instead of which the world is a gorgeous pageant—blue sky, green fields, golden grain, purple moors, and a myriad beautiful shades of flowers. No wonder God said it was 'very good.'

Now mightn't we apply that to people also? After all we should bring brightness to others, carrying, as it were, some lovely colour into their lives. Once when two men were standing for mayor, the one who wasn't chosen criticized the other, asking what he had done to deserve it.

'Oh,' said somebody, 'he has been associated with the great cause of cheering us all up.'

So was Christ our Saviour. Because He so often had a happy word for others, saying, 'Be of good cheer.' In that way too, then, mightn't you yourselves make a happier atmosphere in your home, a cheerier one in your city or town, and altogether a 'Brighter Britain.'

The Christian Year.

THIRD SUNDAY IN ADVENT.

The Christian's Attitude to Health.

BY THE REVEREND STEWART MECHIE, M.A., EDINBURGH.

'Or know ye not that your body is a temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you, which ye have from God? and ye are not your own; for ye were bought with a price: glorify God therefore in your body.'—1 Co $6^{19f.}$ (R.V.).

Is there any specifically Christian attitude to health? Is there anything that a Christian might say about it that a humanist would not say? We hold that there is.

1. *The Christian has the very highest sanctions for obeying the rules of health.* Every sensible man will wish to know the rules of health and to obey them. His own happiness, the happiness of those related to him, his chance of a successful career, his chance of a long life and a pleasant old age; all these considerations, indeed all the dictates of good sense and prudence, point him to a careful regard for the rules of health.

Such considerations may well count with the Christian as well as with other men. But the Christian has other motives impelling him in the same direction which other men lack. What these are may be gathered from a passage at the end of the sixth chapter of First Corinthians. Notice how St. Paul puts in different words what is in substance the same plea. In *v.*[15] he says, 'Know ye not that your bodies are members of Christ?' In *v.*[19] he says, 'Know ye not that your body is a temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you?' In ancient times no crime was regarded more seriously than sacrilege, the crime of profaning sacred things; and the burden of Paul's argument in this passage is that, since the Christian's body is a temple of the Divine Spirit, immorality is an act of sacrilege. It is a profaning of God's temple: it is to act on the assumption that the Christian may do as he pleases with what is really God's dwelling, God's property. 'Ye were bought with a price,' says Paul impressively; and the emphasis of that statement should probably fall not so much on the cost of the Christian's redemption as on the result of it—that the redeemed man has passed into the possession of a new Divine Owner. To continue to practise the low habits of the old evil life is an insult to Him. It is sacrilege, an outrage upon God. If that is true of immoral conduct, it is in a measure true of any disobedience or neglect as regards the laws of health. If the Christian's body is a temple of the Holy Spirit, there can be but one conclusion—'glorify God therefore in your body.'

There is a beautiful prayer of Jeremy Taylor's which may guide us in this matter—'Let my body be a servant of my spirit, and both body and spirit servants of Jesus.' That means, for one thing, that we must never regard our bodies as having no part in the higher life. The body is not a mere source of temptation, nor is it even a negligible quantity, but it has its own honourable place in the full Christian life. For another thing, that means that our bodies have not only to be exercised, but that they have to be mastered. We shall be strict in observing the laws of health and strict to avoid indulgence, because our bodies are to be kept fit as servants of our spirits, so that both may be ready for God's service. Thus for observing the laws of health the Christian has not only the ordinary prudential reasons which may appeal to anyone; he has also the highest and most sacred reasons. 'Know ye not that your body is a temple of the Holy Ghost? . . . glorify God therefore in your body.'

2. *The Christian may find that bodily health has to be sacrificed for the ends of Christ's Kingdom.* When we are young we are sometimes tempted almost to worship bodily health, as if it were an end in itself. In the last few generations particularly young people have been encouraged to give it absolute priority over everything else. But that is to get things quite out of proportion. The body is certainly to be reverenced, but not as master, only as servant, of the spirit. Its life must be used as part of a whole personal life; and that may very well mean that sometimes we may have to break the laws of health for the sake of some

higher end. Many a mother has broken the laws of health as regards her own sleep for the sake of nursing a sick child. Many a doctor or nurse or social worker in the exercise of his vocation has exposed himself to danger of strain and infection. Suppose a case like this—a doctor faced with a man who has contracted consumption and has a great and responsible piece of work in hand. The doctor may have to tell him that he may finish his work at the probable cost of death in six months, or he may drop his work and all useful activity and survive for six years. We may doubt which we should choose to do; but we cannot doubt which, in that position, we ought to do. If it is really God's work, His calling for us, then we know we ought to go on with it and leave the issue of early death or not to Him.

Thus while health is a great good, and, in general, the Christian for the very highest motives will obey the laws of health, yet, on occasion, these very highest motives may impel him the other way. He may find a divine imperative urging him to sacrifice health, even life itself, for the ends of Christ's Kingdom.

3. *A right relation to God is of primary importance for health, whether for the maintenance of good health or for the cure of bad health.* If man is made for fellowship with God, if the body is, in God's intention, a temple of the Holy Ghost, then it stands to reason that the godless man, who is living in neglect of or rebellion against God, will be working against the nature of things and failing to attain the full measure of health that is possible to him. If, however, such a man accepts Christ and so gets right with God, then the Holy Spirit will enter into His temple, and the result is likely to be an accession of health in all parts of the man's being, in some cases apparently miraculous in extent. The famous statement of Jung may be quoted again, for it is to the point. 'Among all my patients in the second half of life—that is to say, over thirty-five—there has not been one whose problem in the last resort was not that of finding a religious outlook on life. It is safe to say that every one of them fell ill because he had lost that which the living religions of every age have given to their followers, and none of them has been really healed who did not regain his religious outlook.' That is from the mental side. Evidence in plenty from the physical side could also be adduced. It is important, however, not to overstate the case. Every truly religious person is not therefore fully healthy in body and mind. No! but this one may say, that, other things being equal, the religious man is healthier than the irreligious. Other things, however, never are equal, so we may express the truth of the matter thus, that a right relation to God is of primary importance whether for the maintenance of good health or for the cure of bad health. Because God's will is best and His love is infinite there is no bound to the possibilities when we become reconciled to that will and let ourselves lie open to that love. If that will involves health for us, we shall have health; if not, we shall have what is better, God's life and love in us now and for ever.

FOURTH SUNDAY IN ADVENT.

They Know His Voice.

'The sheep . . . know his voice . . . a stranger will they not follow, . . . for they know not the voice of strangers.'—Jn 10[4. 5].

'They know his voice . . . they do not know the voice of strangers': that is said of the friends of Jesus, who, as it appears, are like animals and children in not depending altogether on what is said, since for them the voice and the person are enough. A frightened horse in the dark or a barking dog may be quieted at once by hearing the familiar tone, and even some queer congruity of nature may suffice; St. Francis, as the story goes, could draw the birds about him and the fishes and an old grey wolf, and there are many people of whom beasts are never shy. In the same way there are men and women who need no magic of 'the Pied Piper' to have children flocking rejoicingly at their heels. Unfortunately in us who are older this instinct for a friend seems to get blurred, so it is good to hear from Jesus that in the greatest matters the heart still may know its way, and go to its place without a check. 'They know My voice,' says the Master.

1. In this we may find *a searching test of character.* If a Christian man is one who should discern Christ when He speaks and should understand what Christ would have him do, we are forced to admit that our intelligence lags far behind the animal instinct. Watch a dog on the hill with the sheep, and see how promptly he catches at his master's meaning in whistles and hoarse cries of which we make nothing, and compare this with the bearing of a Christian man who knows that his Master wants something of him, yet he halts and fumbles and hangs uncertain, and finally does nothing. In human friendships we show to more advantage, for an intimate acquaintance does not need to give us directions to the last detail; our knowledge of his mind and his taste and his resources enables us to fill in gaps in his instructions and to guess at the kind of thing he would like. And this is Christ's intention for us: 'I have called you not slaves but friends,' He said, 'for a slave does not know what his master means to do.' But if this be His intention we fail most lamentably in giving effect to it. Amid the babel of more clamorous voices we find it hard to pick out His tone or to guess at His meaning in a hint.

Thomas Erskine met a shepherd once on a lonely Scots moor and, after greeting him, he added, 'Do you know the Father?'—not pressing for a prompt reply. Years after on the same hillside they chanced again to meet, and the shepherd this time said, 'I know the Father now.' He possessed the friend's gift of understanding even half-words, and his quickened sense had carried him to the heart of the secret. 'They know My voice,' said Jesus. This is what John meant when, writing to some 'unhighschooled' folk in the Asian Churches which he knew best, he boldly said, 'Ye have an unction from the Holy One,

and ye know all things.' *All things*, he said, although for them there was room for study and further information: yet the essentials—the things which matter were open now before them. The 'unction' of which John speaks is this gift of inward hearing, which enables a man to climb up by the word to Him who gave the word, and there to find rest. 'They know his voice.'

Alongside of this is set the companion grace of not knowing, which also we do well to covet—that blessed and resolved ignorance which does not know the voice of strangers. Some foolish people in what is called 'society' are actually proud of their ready understanding of their neighbours' talk, catching at the sense of ill things insinuated because they cannot openly be declared. It is a doubtful gift at best, and no grace may seem to us so admirable as that innocence of ear on which whatever is unjust or unkind or unclean is lost.

When Jesus said, 'A stranger they will not follow,' He might have added that a stranger they ought not to follow, for this life of ours is too sacred a thing to be put into a stranger's hands. We often see marriages in which men and women, knowing really nothing of each other, yet commit their lives into the other's keeping. In laying His hand on us Christ calls us to tasks and perils—to take His road, to think His thoughts, to love the unlovely as He did, despairing of no man, and to be cheerful in face of every threat; it is a huge adventure, which could not be undertaken in company with one unknown.

2. Along with this test of character there is here also *an intimate test of preaching*. If men show themselves to be Christ's people when they recognize His voice it surely ought to be Christ's voice which His people most wish to hear. Eloquence and wit and learning have their place, but this should be secondary; yet of the companies which, on any Sunday, gather in the churches, how many are drawn by these secondary things, and how many come for what is primary—to hear the Master speaking? There is a charming wee book by an old Scots lady on the author of *Rab and his Friends* which drew from Mark Twain what is surely the supreme of compliments: 'It seems to me the very perfection of literary work, for every sentence seems to say—Don't look at me, look at him! and we must try to be good and obey.' That expresses the first law of right preaching—'Do not look at me, look at Him!' And any preacher who obtrudes himself, by strutting and posing and display, inclining the audience thus to remark on his brilliance and his charm, is in that measure untrue to his commission. The fault does not lie wholly with the preacher, for the humbling fact must be admitted that, in large measure, it is the people who call the tune, and on the whole they get what they desire and what they deserve.

The one vital test of Christian preaching is this—Is it impossible in it to miss the voice and the tone of Jesus Christ? Surely it is to hear Christ speaking that we assemble—to listen for His guidance in our duty, to seek the comfort of His presence in our trouble, and from His own lips to receive the loving sentence of pardon. We must let nothing come between us and that in preaching; for if those are Christ's people who know His voice it is Christ's voice which His people love to hear.

3. When Jesus spoke of His sheep we must remember that His mind was moving forward, and that He claimed men as His before He had them. 'Other sheep I *have*,' He says later, 'and them also I must bring': they might be worshipping in pagan temples though already He called them His, for in them He divined something on which He could lay hold. Throughout His ministry on earth Jesus was continually sifting and separating men, and at His word some rose and followed whilst others remained obtuse. What was there in the events which changed the life of Paul? The narrative speaks of a blinding light and a voice—experiences which, on different levels, have repeatedly been paralleled, and which in many have passed without any lasting result; but processes of struggle had brought Paul to the edge, when a touch could suffice. There are men and women on whom to-day the tenderest and the most powerful appeals would be thrown away, for they are not at the point at which these could be understood; but God's Spirit, working silently, may be bringing them nearer and still nearer to the acknowledgment of Jesus Christ.

He asks a very great thing of us, the greatest of all, for He asks ourselves, and this is a gift which we dare not surrender to one whom we do not know. The heart has its noble and necessary reserves. But He who asks this of us is not a stranger. Blessed are those who hear as the heart heareth, and are prompt at His word to rise and follow Him![1]

CHRISTMAS DAY.

God Touches Human Nature.

BY THE REVEREND R. LEONARD SMALL, M.A., CRAMOND, MIDLOTHIAN.

'The Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us.'—Jn 1[14].

This year 1946, the first full year of peace, has dealt unkindly with many of our long-cherished beliefs, and produced in people of all sorts and conditions a mood of cynicism, disillusionment, and even despair. Not the least deadly of these despairs is our despair about human nature. It grew upon us with a subtle and cumulative effect during six years of war, with all the evil and cruelty which they forced upon our attention, the horrors with which we were sated till we ceased to feel them, and it is with us still. We look round upon our world, and are continually reminded that the real problems are within; hunger and fear still stalk throughout God's world, not because the earth has grown niggardly, sour, and barren, but because of human folly and selfishness, because of envy, strife, bitterness, hatred, the whole deadly list we know so well.

[1] W. M. Macgregor, *Christ and the Church*, 93.

Whether you take the long-range or close-up view, the prospect is the same. The evils that rend the life of Central Europe are basically the same as those which disrupt industrial relationships and divide families, and they seem deep-rooted in human nature. Few thinking people require any further convincing that to change the outward setting of life, say, from war to peace, to develop culture and education, while leaving unchanged the inward heart is to fail miserably. We have gained control over practically every force in the world except human nature; we have learned to develop the latent possibilities in all save ourselves. Must it always be so—must hopes and dreams and lofty resolution and unstinting sacrifice always come to grief on this rock of human nature? But the triumphant message of our Christian faith is that God did and does change human nature, and Christmas is the story of how He set about doing it.

At Christmas, God touched human nature with the touch of understanding. The Chinese have a saying 'heaven knows,' generally used in a fatalistic sense, as if flood and famine, human joy and tears, were known to God only in an impersonal way, a way which only emphasizes the remoteness and aloofness of God. How can God know what human life is like from the inside? God has everything, how can He know what it is like to want—to want food and warmth and comfort, and to see one's children want, to want a house, a home of one's own, to want a different kind of life, to want hope, or freedom or love? How should God know weakness and weariness, and all the ills and woes to which the flesh is heir, its aching longings, its haunting fears, its deep desires? God sees the end from the beginning, the issues of life are ever clear to Him, how can He understand how blind we are, how blundering, how easily misled, how mistaken in our choices? God is holy, what can temptation mean to Him, the sudden fierce temptation that sweeps a man off his feet, the subtle insidious temptation that saps his resistance? Pain of body or mind, anguish of spirit, are to many the only realities, how can they be real to God? How can God know? Christmas forestalls the man who would say: 'God cannot reach down to where I am. He cannot meet me in this situation,' for Christ was born, going lower down than the human level, to lie with the beasts of the stall, and He grew up a member of a subject race, with no rights or privileges. He did not *put on* flesh, to wear it, as H. G. Wells said, 'like a fancy-dress,' He was *made* flesh. When Father Damien first worked among the lepers he saw leprosy with the eyes of Christian understanding and love, but when he spilled boiling water on his arm and felt nothing, and knew he was a leper himself, he saw it in a new way. That is how God sees human nature.

At Christmas, God touched human nature with a touch that makes sacred. When Christ was born men were still drawing hard and fast lines between sacred and secular. The barriers between the various Courts of the Temple were symbolic of men's outlook, for they observed degrees of sacerdness. Certain times were sacred, such as the great Festivals, certain men were sacred, like the priests and Levites, the Temple precincts were sacred, with the Holy of Holies most sacred of all. But unfortunately they had concluded that because *this* is sacred in a special way *that* is not sacred at all. Ordinary life, with all the downward drag of the humdrum and the prosaic, was not sacred and there men lost the sense of God's interest and power. The daily duties of the priest were sacred, but not the day's darg of peasant, or fisherman, or carpenter. The tools of man's work, the stuff of everyday were beneath God's notice, almost contaminating even, so that a man must wash off their defilement before he approached God. Christmas is the story of God coming up behind all these barriers which men have made, touching, with hands at once human and divine, all the stuff of everyday life—straw and sawdust and shavings, the tools of men's toil, the crofter's seed and sickle, the fisherman's boat and nets, the housewife's bread-making, her darning and patching. It is the Word being made flesh and dwelling among men, making sacred childhood and home-life, and work and leisure, all that inescapable setting of normal living by which human nature is so much conditioned and by which, most of all, it is troubled, tempted, tried. How sorely we need to recover that sense of sacredness amid the ever-increasing secularization of life, with its bustle and jostling, and its mechanized relationships! During one of the Recall to Religion Campaigns a minister was sent to a market-town in the Borders to speak to the farmers on market-day. He was set in the auctioneer's box in the selling ring, with the farmers busy at their bargaining, and the place full of the lowing of the cattle and the bleating of sheep. How was he to gain a hearing against that background of noise and in that unlikely setting? He raised his voice and said: 'Friends, this may seem a queer place to listen to the message of a Christian minister. But, after all, the event which gives me any message at all took place in a stable with the noises of sheep and cattle for accompaniment.' A strange sense of sacredness seemed to fall upon every man, and he was heard in reverent silence, silence which the noise of the animals hardly seemed to break. So the story of Christmas falls again across the noise and bustle of our daily life, our getting and spending, reminding us that God still believes in the capacity of human nature to respond to the touch that makes all life sacred.

At Christmas, God touched human nature with the touch that transforms. The whole story of the life of Jesus from the cradle to the Cross is like that old legend of the king with the 'golden touch.' Christmas is the first stage in a process, not yet ended, whereby God got 'into touch' in a new way with frail and baffling human nature, touched it at every point, and transformed it wherever He touched it. He touched the sick, and made them whole; the blind, and sight came; the fallen, and they rose and walked; the hope-

less, and light came back to their eyes and joy to their hearts; the sinful, and they found the wonder of redemption. He took a towel and basin and transformed all common service, He took daily bread and made of it a sacrament, He touched the horror of a Cross and made it a symbol of incomparable victory, He touched death and changed it for ever. Whatever He touched He transformed. When He was made flesh, He crowned human flesh and blood, all the raw material of human nature, with a new glory and dignity. He taught men to see God most perfectly revealed not in the wonder of a sunset, or the marvel of the starry sky, but in a human personality. The Incarnation declares to us in this year of our despair about human nature that in that same human nature more of God can be seen than anywhere else in all creation. 'When Lamennais preached in Notre Dame,' writes Alistair Maclean, 'the poor and the outcast of Paris crowded into it, listening to . . . that rousing cry that shook them from their despair. "There is always one place left," cried Lamennais. "There is always one place left for God to take hold."' Let Christmas 1946 send that rousing cry ringing again through our weariness, our cynicism, and our disillusionment. When God can find one place left to take hold of human nature, who should despair?

First Sunday after Christmas.

Life's Short Story.

By the Reverend Philip W. Lilley, M.A., Rhu, Dunbartonshire.

'We spend our years as a tale that is told.'—Ps 90[9].

'When you were young,' so writes Mr. E. L. Woodward, in his delightful reminiscences, *Short Journey*, 'you did not believe that you would ever need to reckon the years. You had an infinity of time; every one has an infinity of time, but no time is long enough for any child of man.' That is a fairly apposite comment on the mood of the man who wrote the Hebrew Hymn of Eternity. Jerome in his Latin version renders the phrase 'as a tale that is told' in these words, 'As one who tells a story'; and the root idea is that the story of life is quickly told, and the word '*Finis*' soon written at the foot of the last page. Life is pathetic in its brevity and frailty. That is the Psalmist's plaintive cry.

These are often our silent thoughts, too, as time glides swiftly by. In a memorable passage in his *Memoirs*, Edward Gibbon told how on the night of the 27th of June 1787, between the hours of eleven and twelve, he wrote 'the last lines of the last page' of the History which has made him for ever celebrated. He refers (with becoming modesty) to the possible establishment of his fame as the author of *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*. Then he adds these wistful words: 'But my pride was soon humbled, and a sober melancholy was spread over my mind, by the idea that I had taken an everlasting leave of an old and agreeable companion, and that whatsoever might be the future date of my History, the life of the historian must be short and precarious.' Such thoughts, I say, are borne in upon us too as the year dies, yet a feeling of gloom and the sense that all is vanity does not have its source in 'the good hours of the mind.'

When we ponder the phrase 'As one who tells a story' in the light of Christian teaching and experience, we receive also many bracing and encouraging thoughts.

1. In the first place, the Christian is entitled to believe that *his life is a Love Story*. 'All the world loves a lover.' We all enjoy the old-fashioned romance which tells how two hearts became one. That kind of story can never grow old. 'Time cannot wither nor custom stale its infinite variety.'

> Yonder a maid and her wight
> Come whispering by:
> War's annals will cloud into night
> Ere their story die.

But what of life of a sadder order—life with its tragedy and triumph, its toils and tears, its sufferings and losses—are we still able to say, as we review our own lives that the story is one of Divine guidance and Divine Love? When we confront the grim facts of life, as we have seen them recorded in the unspeakable losses of the last few years, are we still convinced that 'God is Love'? Robert Browning wrote:

> I know thee, who hast kept my path, and made
> Light for me in the darkness, tempering sorrow
> So that it reached me like a solemn joy;
> It were too strange that I should doubt thy love.

That is a conviction that is not always achieved without a struggle nor is it always easily kept. If a man asserts it lightly, it only shows he has not had to wrestle for it. Many heard Joseph Parker preach in the heyday of his powers, and the crowds were delighted by his originality and eloquence. But there came the day when the wife whom he passionately loved was taken from him. He climbed up into his pulpit a broken-hearted man, still dazed by the heavy stroke that had been laid on him. 'God—is—Love,' came in little breathless gasps as from the lips of a man contending for his soul's life, and those who heard him were hushed and subdued. No, it is not always easy to believe in God's Love.

Yet, let us not forget that it is those who have been the greatest sufferers who have also been the greatest believers. They believed that all they had undergone was 'part of the story.'

> With mercy and with judgment
> My web of time He wove,
> And aye the dews of sorrow
> Were lustred by His love.

2. Secondly, this life-story is also *a Serial Story*, a tale which is unfolding day by day, and year by year. At the beginning of their literary careers Anthony Trollope and Charles Dickens wrote

novels which appeared in instalments in important magazines. We may gauge the popularity of these novelists from the fact that it was with avidity and impatience that the British reading-public awaited the various issues. They were eager to discover the fortunes of the various characters described in their stories: thus they were led on and on, fascinated spectators of the doings of these creations of the imagination.

Our lives are like a serial story, at least in this respect that we only receive instalments, as it were. We are certainly not allowed to read the next chapter in advance. All we are given is the present unfolding. All we can do is to wait and see what God has in store for each one of us, being assured that everything works together for good to them that love God, for we walk by faith and not by sight. And when the earthly part of the story is finished, we also can write at the foot of life's page—'To be continued in our next.'

3. Hence, also, it is *a Story the influence of which never comes to an end.* That is true of all good books. Their influence never dies. John Milton said, 'A good book is the precious life-blood of a master spirit embalmed and treasured up to a life beyond life.' Even when we have read the last word of the last page and gaze on the familiar word, '*Finis*,' we know that that is not the real end of the book. The book lives on through the centuries that are to be. No one can fix a time-limit for the influence of such books as *Don Quixote* or *The Pilgrim's Progress*.

Now, so is it with you and me, if our lives are lived in the strength of God. The words which were spoken by Pericles at a Greek funeral many centuries ago are true of all those who have striven to extend the empire of the good and the beautiful over the minds of men. 'Their story is graven not on stone alone, but lives on without symbol woven into the very fabric of other men's lives.' 'The invisible world,' says Elizabeth Goudge, 'must be saturated with the stories that men tell both by their minds and by their lives.' How solemnizing to reflect that 'every action, every thought, is a tiny thread to spoil or enrich that tremendous tapestried story that men weave on the loom that God has set up, a loom that stretches from heaven above to earth below.' Yes, the stories that people tell and live are so interwoven with other people's lives that they never come to an end. The influence we exert, whether we like it or not, whether for good or for bad, never dies but goes on and on into eternity.

4. Finally, it is *a Story which is being written now.* Montaigne could say of his *Essays*, 'My book is myself.' There was something so deeply personal about everything he wrote. But isn't that also true of your life and mine? In one sense we are all engaged in writing a book. Each one of us is penning it now. We write it as the years go by. We have almost added another chapter to it—chapter 1946.

Perhaps some of you may feel that it might have been a better and more creditable chapter. You may even feel that it has been somewhat of a failure. If that be our conviction, then we are on the threshold of a new beginning, and the later chapters may atone for the preceding ones. Whatever may follow in 1947, may, by the help of God, be a fine contribution to the whole story. It may be that for some of us there will be only a few more pages to write; but we can make these pages the best in the whole Serial, for we can determine even now whether it is to be a good story or a bad one.

We may here and now ask God's present help and grace. For He is, as it were, the great Proprietor and Editor of the large Publishing House of human endeavour. We may ask that 'the beauty of the Lord our God may be upon us and that He will establish the work of our hands.' If we seek His all-sufficient grace, and maintain a trustful and resolute spirit, we may make 1947 the best of all New Years. We shall make the tale of our life a story of unfaltering faith, high courage, and unchanging love. It was said of a good woman, 'She might have written books—famous books. Yet what of books? Hast thou not a volume to publish in print that is everlasting, namely a life to lead?' And surely this is a great concern, calling for our utmost effort and worthy of our most prayerful toil.

SECOND SUNDAY AFTER CHRISTMAS.

The New Beginning.

BY PROFESSOR THE REVEREND JOHN FOSTER, D.D., SELLY OAK COLLEGES.

'Ye must be born anew.'—Jn 3[7] (R.V.).

A Hindu and a Christian were discussing religion. The Hindu claimed Hinduism to be the most complete apprehension of God. The Christian said, 'Very well. Suppose I were to agree. Now how do I become a Hindu?' 'Oh, you can't do that,' was the answer. 'You are either born a Hindu or you aren't.' Then recalling the doctrine of transmigration, his face brightened. 'Yes, you have one hope,' he said. 'If you commit suicide, in your next incarnation you may be born a Hindu.'

It may seem strange to say that similar views are expressed, or at any rate implied, by Europeans. People ask, 'Why preach our Christianity in China?' It is theirs or ours according to birth. Many of us treat religion as something which we have inherited, like nationality or the colour of our skin. Any one who knows the New Testament at all will recognize that in Christianity you have a view of religion which is radically different. Birth shuts the door on no man. Nor is it birth which opens it to any.

The survival of this attitude to religion is not surprising for a second reason: it is the oldest and most nearly universal. All early religion was a matter of being born so. Born in this family, your duty is to the shades of your ancestors and the gods of your father's house. Born in this

tribe, you belong to this totem. Born in this city, you worship the city's guardian gods. It was so among the Hebrews, who worshipped Jehovah as the family god of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and the Leader of the Twelve Tribes. It was so in the city-states of Greece, and in that greatest of the cities, which was to become an Empire, Rome. At the other end of the world the same principle held good, While the Jews were captive in Babylon, when the Greek states were thriving, and before Rome had risen to pre-eminence, in China Confucius was teaching, 'For a man to worship a spirit which is not his own is arrogance.' Right through the ancient world it runs. A stranger might pay a passing tribute; occasionally might even live down his strangeness and find his part; but in general the doors were shut to family, tribal, and state religion. You were born so, or not born so, and that was that.

In the East it was Buddhism which brought a new and deeper appreciation of religion. In the West a new spectacle arises with the Mystery Religions. Men were growing up and beginning to feel the growing pains of a deep inward dissatisfaction. A man knew himself to be more than a son, a tribesman, a citizen. He was a *man*, with his own life to live, his own sorrows to endure, and his own death to die. The religions which provided for family welfare, tribal victory, the prosperity of the State, no longer met his needs. He needed a message of individual salvation. This was provided by new religious societies which grew up first in Greece, afterwards throughout the Roman Empire. Some of the societies had travelling preachers, who held open-air meetings and distributed tracts, not unlike the early Methodists or the Salvation Army. They told of gods who cared for man as man, would help him live his individual life in triumph, and save his soul eternally, The great difference was that in these religions you were not born so. You had to be re-born. You decided for yourself, and one by one you joined the new society.

Judaism itself, the most highly developed and one of the most proud-spirited of the tribal-national religions, changed. Some of the dissatisfied were quick to recognize in the Jews a people with a deeper sense of religion than their own. Could they join *this* society? Jews of an earlier day would have replied, No, you were not born so. But in the books of the Old Testament, written about the time of the Exile, we see a wider vision. Jehovah is not only a national god but—God. God's spirit not only moves among His chosen. It shall be poured upon all flesh. In the period between the Testaments they began to recognize a regular procedure for admitting the outsider. Opening the New Testament we find signs of the presence of two already large classes of men. It is from among them that most of the first Christian converts are to be won. The first is called 'proselytes,' the second 'God-fearers.' For example, the darkness of his skin does not keep the Ethiopian eunuch from going to Jerusalem to worship. His Roman birth does not shut out Cornelius the centurion from faith in the God of Israel. Both these were probably 'God-fearers'—or as we should say, adherents. It was not easy to become a full proselyte. That is why so many never got further than the threshold.

Then came John the Baptist. We are so used to the term baptism, and to thinking that we know what it means, that we may have missed the significance of this title. Baptism, ceremonial washing, was already known both within and without Judaism. Without, it was part of the process of entering those religious societies called the Mysteries. Within, it was required of foreigners who sought admittance. John brought a new demand. Standing within the boundaries of Judaism he required baptism of Jews: 'I baptize you with water unto repentance.' It was as if he said, 'You call them dirty Gentiles, but you are dirty Jews.' 'Think not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father.' And to the proudest of them, even to Pharisees, he said, 'Sons of Abraham?—Offspring of vipers!' Strong words they were, but acted in more startling parable when crowds of Jews, for all the world as if they had not been 'born so,' came to wash away their sins in the waters of Jordan. That was the first meaning of baptism; it is not enough to be born. You must be re-born. The choice is not your parents', but your own.

Then came Jesus, 'preaching the gospel of God, and saying, The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand; repent ye, and believe in the gospel.' Indeed all that I have described is part of that preparation to which those words 'the time is fulfilled' refer. St. Paul is thinking of the same when he speaks of 'the fulness of the time': 'When the fulness of the time came, God sent forth his Son.' When the most sincere souls, both within Judaism and without, knew that religion was a matter for their own choosing, God sent forth Him who was to fix men's choice. 'Follow Me!' And Simon followed; Andrew followed; James followed; John followed; not because they were born so but because one by one they had caught His eye and seen Him beckon.

Some, indeed most, refused to meet His challenge and to make His choice. These were for the most part not sinners who had lost hold of respectability and so put themselves out of count. They were men of comparatively blameless life, who thought it was enough to have inherited religion and to keep it up. They had no place in His Kingdom. In all the Gospels is not this the most frequent theme? Two outstanding examples will be enough:

Zacchæus was not given to boasting about his birth. He knew that as a tax-gatherer for the Roman overlord he was playing a game unworthy of a true son of Abraham. But he met the challenge. He opened the door of his house and the door of his heart. And, 'To-day is salvation come to this house, for so much as he also is a son of Abraham. For the Son of man is come to seek and to save that which was lost.' He gave him back his birthright.

Nicodemus the Pharisee, a ruler of the Jews—that means a member of the Sanhedrin—doubted not that he was born of the seed of Abraham and an heir to the promises of God. And, 'Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born anew, he cannot see the kingdom of God.' It amounted to recognizing the citizenship of a banishee, and telling a member of his nation's aristocracy that he could not be permitted to land.

Where do you stand?

'I was brought up in a Christian home.' That is not the point.

'I was baptized, and you said baptism was the sign of rebirth.' Adult baptism was and is. Infant baptism is rather the promise of something on which you yourself must afterwards lay hold.

'I have tried to live according to accepted standards, and took it for granted that I was all right.' He will not lash you with His words, as John the Baptist used to do. But at His coming the self-satisfied are struck with still greater dismay at His calm and awful assumption that your world is upside down and you must begin again.

Sojourners in Egypt.

By the Reverend E. W. Heaton, M.A., Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge.

The initial purpose of this article is to raise the question of the interpretation of the word *gēr* in Dt 23[7]: 'Thou shalt not abhor an Edomite; for he is thy brother: thou shalt not abhor an Egyptian; because thou wast a *gēr* in his land.' Robertson Smith in a few classic paragraphs has taught us to recognize in *gēr* a semi-technical term used to describe 'a man of another tribe or district, who, coming to sojourn in a place where he was not strengthened by the presence of his own kin, put himself under the protection of a clan or of a powerful chief.'[1] In the vast majority of the cases of its use in the Old Testament it refers to the alien population living among the Jews in Palestine.[2]

It is therefore interesting to find the term used in this verse of the Jews themselves, and, in view of the customary nuance of privilege which it carries, it is surprising to find it associated here with their status in Egypt before the Exodus. Elsewhere the deuteronomic writers (to use a convenient term) look back on Egypt at this period as the 'iron furnace' כּוּר הַבַּרְזֶל[3] and as a 'house of slaves' בֵּית עֲבָדִים,[4] in which the Jews were the Pharaoh's 'bondmen' עֲבָדִים.[5]

[1] *Religion of the Semites*[3], 75 f.

[2] It appears that the word *gēr* was very little used before the deuteronomic writers (or alternatively the authors of H) made it the current term to describe the aliens who by this time had made their homes in Palestine. The three passages, Ex 2^{22} 22^{21a} and 23^{12}, do not provide very strong evidence for the earlier use of the term (cf. note 6, p. 82).

[3] Dt 4^{20}, 1 K 8^{51}, Jer 11^{4}.

[4] Dt 5^{6} 6^{12} 7^{8} 8^{14} $13^{5.\ 10}$, Ex $13^{3.\ 14}$, Jos 24^{17}, Jg 6^{8} (probably all deuteronomic); cf. Mic 6^{4}, Jer 34^{13}.

[5] Dt 6^{21}; cf. 5^{15} 15^{15} 16^{12} $24^{18.\ 22}$.

In what sense, it must be asked, could the Jew who endured this servitude properly be described as a *gēr*?

Now it is sufficiently clear from the prophets' condemnation of the exploitation of the *gēr* that his lot was not always a happy one[6] and the association of the *gērim* with various classes of dependants (sons, daughters, the fatherless and widows)[7] confirms our impression of their social inferiority, which becomes explicit in such passages as Dt 14^{21} and 29^{11}. If, however, we cannot idealize their position, the many warnings against exploiting them do at the same time clearly suggest that the word *gēr* was still used to indicate an alien with a recognized status. If the *gēr* in Dt 24^{14} is thought of as a hired servant שָׂכִיר, the same verse envisages the possibility that the home-born Israelite may well become the same. Again, if the association of גֵּר and תּוֹשָׁב in Lev 25 indicates an inferior status, as has been suggested by Meek,[8] it is one which clearly does not belong to the *gēr* as such, since it is shared by the Israelite brother, and moreover, it is one which is sharply differentiated from that of the bondservant: 'And if thy brother be waxen poor with thee, and sell himself unto thee; thou shalt not make him to serve as a bondservant עֶבֶד: as an hired servant שָׂכִיר, and as a sojourner תּוֹשָׁב, he shall be with thee' (Lev $25^{39f.}$).

Not only is the *gēr* (as תּוֹשָׁב) distinguished from

[6] Jer 7^{6} 14^{8} 22^{3}, Ezk $22^{7.\ 29}$, Zec. 7^{10}, Mal 3^{5}.

[7] Dt 5^{14} 10^{18} 14^{29} $16^{11.\ 14}$ $24^{14.\ 17.\ 19.\ 20}$, etc.; cf. *Ency. Bib.*, col. 4186 and 3902; *DB*, ii. 156, col. 1.

[8] 'The Translation of *Gēr* in the Hexateuch,' in *Journal of Biblical Literature*, xlix. (1930), 172 f.

the bondman and associated with the Israelite, but, as appears from Dt 1^{16} (cf. 24^{17} and 27^{19}), he had a right to refer his disputes to judges. Our conclusion is that we are not justified in abandoning the fundamental meaning of the term in reference to one who, though an alien and excluded from the privileges of full membership of the tribe, enjoyed certain concessions and a status which was 'one of dependence but not of absolute servitude.' [1]

As Dt 23^{7} represents the status of the Jews in Egypt as that of *gērim* and the deuteronomic writers as one of 'absolute servitude,' some explanation is demanded. S. R. Driver saw the problem: 'In spite of the Egyptians' oppression of Israel,' he comments, 'in spite, too, of the distrust and suspicion with which the prophets viewed the political interference of the Pharaohs with the affairs of Palestine, the Israelites had once been *sojourners* in their land; and the recollection of this fact should soften their attitude towards them.' [2] It is difficult to understand how a recollection of their treatment in Egypt as it is represented elsewhere [3] could have been expected to soften their attitude towards their former oppressors. It is true that the deuteronomic writers frequently remind the Israelite that he had been a bondman עָבַד in Egypt, but as we should have expected, these historical references in every case merely serve to recall the fundamental conviction that the nation had been redeemed by Yahweh from the bondage, and it is to the Israelite's memory of redemption and not of bondage that the appeal is made.[4] In Dt 23^{7}, however (and still more explicitly in the related interpolation of Ex 23^{9}, 'for ye know the heart of a *gēr*'), the appeal is to the Israelite's experience of the sojourn itself and not to his memory of deliverance from it.

It is difficult to resist the conclusion that the word *gēr* was intended to recall either a lively tradition or an actual experience of a sojourn in Egypt which was favourable—sufficiently favourable to encourage the Israelites to receive the Egyptians (presumably the children of mixed Hebrew-Egyptian marriages) into the 'assembly of Yahweh' in the third generation.[5]

Before we attempt to draw any tentative conclusions about the meaning of *gēr* and the view of the sojourn in Egypt which this verse implies, we must examine four other passages in which similarly an appeal is made to the Hebrews as the *gērim* of Egypt.

(*a*) Ex 22^{21b-22}, in which occurs the expression כִּי־גֵרִים הֱיִיתֶם בְּאֶרֶץ מִצְרָיִם, is generally regarded as an interpolation on independent grounds. It is expressed in the singular and so interrupts a passage in the plural which forms its present context.[6]

(*b*) Ex 23^{9}, in which the same expression recurs, is part of a longer section (*vv.*$^{6-9}$) built up of borrowed fragments; with the commentators, therefore, we may account it a secondary redaction.

(*c*) Lev 19^{34} contains the identical formula. The word *gēr* in the Holiness Code normally carries a meaning which is almost equivalent to proselyte,[7] and so unless we can suppose that this quasi-technical term was on this one occasion used in so loose an application as to make it suitable for describing an Israelite in 'bondage,' we cannot follow Carpenter and Harford-Battersby in allowing that the expression is original in its present context. The fact that the expression is a *formula* precludes our being certain of its origin, and the great diversity of the material in ch. 19 makes it reasonable to suppose that here also the words do not belong to their context.

(*d*) Dt 10^{19} also has the formula. There is no evidence for the supposition that here it is borrowed from Lev 19^{34}.

In these four verses, 'the recollection of the feelings of a sojourner, derived from the experiences of Egypt' (to use Driver's words) is made the motive of a moral injunction to befriend the *gērim* settled in Israel. The fact that in each case we have the identical form of words interpolated into their present context suggests very strongly that we should associate this friendly formula with Dt 23^{7}. At one period in the life of Israel, it appears that an attempt was made to absorb Egyptians into the Jewish community: this is the conclusion required by the explicit legislation of Dt 23^{7} and that suggested by the deliberate interpolation of the formula in the other four passages.

[1] Meek, *op. cit.*

[2] *Deuteronomy* (*I.C.C.*), 262.

[3] See p. 80, notes 3, 4, and 5; cf. Ex $1^{11f.}$ $3^{7.17}$ $5^{6f.}$ (J) and Dt $26^{5f.}$

[4] Dt 5^{15} 15^{15} 24^{18}; 16^{12} and 24^{22}, which do not actually mention the deliverance, may be said to imply it.

[5] If the word *gēr* (by some unexpected and unaccountable weakening of its usual meaning) had been used to recall a tradition of bondage-and-deliverance, the verse would have been, in effect, an injunction to the Israelites to love their enemies. The difficulty of supposing that the teaching of Mt 5^{44} was thus anticipated is insuperable. It hardly needs to be pointed out that in Ex 23^{9} 'the heart (feelings) of a *gēr*' cannot be identified with an experience of oppression on the grounds that it is appealed to against the oppression of the *gēr* in the Israelites' midst, since it is generally agreed that this appeal to their feelings is part of the late interpolation.

[6] McNeile, *Exodus*, 136; Carpenter and Harford-Battersby, *Hexateuch*, ii. 116.

[7] Lev 16^{29} 18^{26} $24^{16.22}$, etc.; cf. Meek, *op. cit.*, 174 f.

In view of the 'canonical' attitude towards Egypt, what experience was the writer or school of writers appealing to as a precedent for this friendly relationship between Jews and Egyptians? Was it a vivid memory of 'the sojourn' in Egypt before the entry into Palestine, which was quite independent of the 'bondage-and-deliverance' tradition and which is now in our documents almost obliterated by it? Or was it a more recent experience of the Egyptian diaspora?

These questions are too far-reaching for one to attempt to answer them here, but we may briefly notice indications that the 'bondage-and-deliverance' view of the early history does not wholly monopolize our narratives, even if this—the 'canonical'—tradition is the one generally accepted. There is, for instance, evidence in the Pentateuch and elsewhere that 'there was a form of the patriarchal tradition which knew nothing of the sojourn in Egypt, and connected the story of the conquest with the name of Jacob.'[1] When this is admitted, the view that there existed variant traditions of the sojourn and exodus becomes intrinsically more probable.

It is more relevant to our immediate inquiry to notice that in the Joseph stories (Gn 37 f.), we have a tradition of a large-scale Egyptian sojourn, which, although now artificially attached to the regular 'bondage-and-deliverance' scheme (Ex 1^{8}), is really independent.[2] In view of the usual suspicion of Egypt, it is remarkable that this record of the cordial relationship which once existed between Jews and Egyptians has survived.[3]

Again, it is worth noticing that the fragmentary narrative in Exodus attributed to E differs from the J narrative with which it is interwoven in several important particulars. When the separation of the various strata in the combined narratives can no longer be made with the confidence which inspired the early exponents of the documentary hypothesis, it is only possible to record the impression that the author or authors of E either knew little of the 'bondage' as it is presented in J (and D), or were not interested in it. The E narrative presents a picture of an uneventful period in Egypt which is as properly described as a 'sojourn' as that of the Joseph stories, with which indeed it has some very interesting affinities.[4]

The case for holding that the 'bondage-and-deliverance' tradition was not the only view of the early history is less weak than Lods' insistence that our evidence 'does not merely speak of a *sojourn* in Mizraim, but of the *enslavement* of the fathers in this country'[5] would make it appear. It is possible that the narratives to which we have briefly referred reflect a lively tradition of an Egyptian sojourn before the conquest of Palestine quite different from that which is now presented in J and D, and that it was to this tradition that the legislator of Dt 23^{7} and the author of the formula in the other four passages were appealing. On the other hand, it is possible that these narratives represent not so much traditional history as apologetic historiography, drawing on a more recent experience of Egypt, and perhaps written with the deliberate intention of supporting the newly inaugurated policy of friendship towards the Egyptians.[6]

[1] Skinner, *Genesis*, 422; cf. pp. xxii. n. 1, 418, 450, 507, and 512. See also Cook in *E.Br.*[11], xi. 584, art. 'Genesis'; xv. 374, art. 'Jews'; *Cambridge Ancient History*, ii. 359–60.

[2] Cf. Cook and authorities, *E.Br.*[11], xv. 374, note 2.

[3] In this connexion the E narrative is the more interesting. Here Joseph is not a prisoner but a servant of the guard (37^{36}). The passage which records Pharaoh's eulogy and investiture of Joseph belongs in part (and probably in its entirety) to E. In E also, it is the Pharaoh who invites Joseph's brethren to Egypt ($46^{17f.}$), and after their arrival they are represented as dwelling, not in the land of Goshen as in J (Gn 45^{10} 46^{28} 47^{26}; cf. Ex 8^{22} 9^{26}), but among the Egyptians. It has been frequently noticed that this cycle of stories shows an intimate acquaintance with Egyptian customs and conditions and it has been suggested that this knowledge was acquired at a much later period when the stories were being elaborated; cf. Skinner, *Genesis*, 442; Cook, *Cambridge Ancient History*, ii. 360; Kennett, *O.T. Essays*, 40 f.; Peet, *Egypt and the Old Testament*, 65, 90–94, 102–3.

[4] In E the Jews make up a small company (Ex $1^{15f.}$), one obviously too small to undertake the conquest of Palestine, and they are represented as living, not apart in the land of Goshen, but, as in the Joseph stories, among the Egyptians (Ex 1^{15} 3^{22} 11^{2}). Moses, whose name and upbringing associate him closely with Egypt (Ex 2^{1-10}) wins for himself among the Egyptians a reputation equalled only by that of Joseph (Ex 11^{3}). He demands of the Pharaoh 'merely that Israel be let go' for the purpose of returning to Canaan (cf. the useful analysis of Harford-Battersby, in *HDB*, i. 807). The departure from Egypt is associated with the promise of Joseph (Ex $13^{17f.}$; cf. Gn 50^{25} 48^{21}) and is made in good order (חֲמֻשִׁים) (Ex 13^{18}), with Joseph's bones (Ex 13^{19}), after the Jews' Egyptian neighbours, in whose eyes they had found favour (Ex 11^{3}), had equipped them for the journey (Ex 3^{21-22} 11^{2} 12^{36}); cf. Dillmann quoted in Driver's *Exodus* (pp. 26 and 100): 'According to the tradition as handed down by E, the Israelites at their departure received from their Egyptian acquaintances, who were favourably disposed towards them, and held Moses in honour, all kinds of valuables.' That Dillmann found this a difficult conclusion is clear from his attempt to harmonize the traditions in the manner of Jubilees 48^{18}, etc.

[5] *Israel*, Eng. tr., p. 169.

[6] There is, of course, nothing new in the suggestion that the experience of the exilic period contributed to the narratives recording the history of the period of the Exodus; see Cook, *C.A.H.*, ii. 405. The early Egyptian diaspora is perhaps more important than we tend to suppose: see the suggestive pages of Causse, *Les Dispersées d'Israël* (1929), 17–23. Cf. Peet: 'The

Contributions and Comments.

The Son of Man.

Some Observations on Mr. Fox's Criticism in the September Number.

1. I DID not 'quote Dalman verbatim' on p. 217 of *The Teaching of Jesus*. I stated as a fact what is stated in similar but not identical terms by Dalman in *Grammatik*[2], 108 and *Words of Jesus*, 249 f. I cited Dalman as an authority for the fact and for nothing else. The rest is admittedly conjecture.

2. It is true that the conjecture would not have been accepted by Dalman, who maintained (p. 250) 'that at that time . . . אֱנָשׁ and not בַּר אֱנָשׁ was the common term for "man."' Yet even if בַּר אֱנָשׁ was not the common term, it must have been a possible term for 'man'; otherwise its presence in Dn 7[13] is inexplicable. Dalman argued that it is only there as a translation of the Hebrew בֶּן אָדָם. That may be so. But even if it is so, it is required in a translation that it should represent the meaning of the translated term and be intelligible to those for whom the translation is made: *i.e.*, that בַּר אֱנָשׁ should mean the same as בֶּן אָדָם and should mean it to Aramaic-speaking Jews round about the beginning of the Christian era. Moreover, *barnāsh* has the required meaning in Christian Palestinian Aramaic which Schulthess described as 'die direkte Fortsetzung der Sprache Jesu' (*Gramm. des Chr.-pal. Aram.* § 4 Anm. 3; cf. § 81. 7). It may well be the case that the use of the Hebrew בֶּן אָדָם, and of בַּר אֱנָשׁ in earlier Aramaic, was largely confined to elevated and poetical speech: the Q passage about John the Baptist (Lk 7[24-35], Mt 11[7-19]) is an excellent example of such elevated and poetical speech, as was perceived by John Jebb more than a century ago (*Sacred Literature* [1820], 238–244).

3. I hope in the not too remote future to return to the whole problem of the use of the term 'Son of Man' in the Gospels. There are many respects in which the treatment in my *Teaching of Jesus* can be improved and the main contention of the argument fortified. That, however, is something that must go far beyond the possible limits of an article in this magazine. T. W. MANSON.

University of Manchester.

Entre Nous.

Dr. Temple as a Man.

In the always interesting book[1] on the late Archbishop one of its six authors deals with the personality of Dr. Temple. This writer is the Rev. A. E. Baker, Canon of York Minster, who writes from the intimacy of an old friend. The impression one receives from this sketch is that of a modest, affectionate, good-tempered being, without affectation or pride, full of the zest for life. He might be called justly the Laughing Philosopher. Canon Baker asked an old Reptonian why Dr. Temple went to Repton as headmaster. The reply was, 'Oh, it was to outlaugh old Z. on his own ground.' Z. was famous for his large and terrific laugh!

Once at a meeting which was attended by Gore and Temple, Gore so completely lost his temper that the meeting had to be abandoned. On the

[1] *William Temple: An Estimate and an Appreciation.*

XXVIth Dynasty had encouraged the settlement of foreigners in the Nile valley, partly as traders, partly as mercenaries in the Egyptian armies. Among those who flocked in, there may well have been many Jews, more especially in the period preceding the fall of Jerusalem, when the factions of Assyrophile and Egyptophile were rife. The temporary ascendency of one party must often have forced prominent members of the other to retire to the country whose interests they supported,' *Egypt and the Old Testament*, 189; cf. also Oesterley and Robinson, *History of Israel*, ii. 40–41; Mitchell, *Zechariah* (*I.C.C.*), 292–3. (There is no more reason for depreciating the importance of the Egyptian diaspora on the evidence of the Elephantine Papyri than there would be for ignoring the work of the exilic community in Babylon on the evidence of the Murashu tablets.) It is interesting to find the verb גּוּר used in Jeremiah of the voluntary exilic sojourn in Egypt which eventually the prophet himself had to join (42[15. 17. 22] 44[8. 12. 14. 28]). The same word is used of the exilic dispersion in La 4[15], Ezr 1[4] and Ezk 20[38]. In Is 52[4], if Skinner's interpretation is correct (*Camb. Bible*, 129), גּוּר implies no more than exile. Previous oppression is associated with the Assyrians, but even that provides no precedent for the suffering of the present exiles. A comparison of the distribution in the O.T. of the words גּוּר and יָשַׁב suggests very strongly that the former was used in the technical sense which belongs to גֵּר and that, as in the case of גֵּר, a large part of its meaning was drawn from the experience of dispersion and exile. Gn 12[10] and 47[4] in which גּוּר is used of the sojourn in Egypt are almost certainly late additions; Dt 26[5f.], which is also late, combines the conflicting traditions of sojourn and bondage, as the (late) passage Gn 15[13] in which גֵּר is employed.

way home Gore was gloomy and miserable over his exhibition and lamented his loss of self-control. 'I have a vile temper,' he said. 'It is a terrible thing to have a bad temper.' And then, as he looked at Temple's smiling face, 'but it is not so bad as having a good temper!'

Temple was, of course, deeply interested in the social problem, and held radical views, as Malvern showed. When Mr. Neville Chamberlain was Chancellor of the Exchequer, Dr. Temple wrote to *The Times* just before a Budget statement, suggesting that if there was not enough money both to reduce the Income Tax and to increase the 'dole' the Chancellor should increase the 'dole.' Mr. Chamberlain replied tartly that he wished the Archbishop of York would mind his own business. Dr. Temple's rejoinder was neat and effective. There are two men with buckets, he said; I advise the better-off man to say, if there is not enough to put some in both buckets, please put it all in his. 'And I should have thought it very much the business of a Christian minister to give that kind of advice, and to encourage that kind of practical unselfishness.'

Dr. Temple's wide sympathies were known all over the Christian world. His friendships included men of all ranks and creeds. He was a great thinker, but it is not perhaps saying too much to say that he was a great Christian. In both respects his death has meant a profound loss to all the churches. F. J. Rae.

How Heathen is Britain?

How Heathen is Britain? is the title of a book by B. C. Sandhurst (Collins: 2s. 6d. net) that should be widely read. Eighteen months ago he took over the duty of discussing post-war problems with young men likely to become officers. They were drawn from the public and secondary schools, of age between eighteen and twenty-two. The author meant to 'put over' the principle of the Christian social order, but he soon discovered that most of his audience didn't know what Christianity is. Moreover, he discovered that it was no use plunging into the discussion of Christian evidence straight away. And, after experimenting this way and that, he concluded that he must approach his aim gradually. First he put the plain question: Is man simply a highly developed animal or something more? And, secondly, Are there permanent standards of goodness and truth? Finally, he tackled the question of the Godhead of Christ and His consequent authority to command us.

At first he found blank ignorance, but, to his amazement, as he went on he met with a readiness on the part of a large proportion of his classes to receive the truth he was aiming to get over. Mr. C. S. Lewis, who writes a Preface to the book, sums up its lessons thus. 'When every allowance has been made for the possibility that the author has unusual talents as a teacher, two facts still emerge from his record unshaken. First, that the content of, and case for, Christianity are not put before most schoolboys under the present system; and, secondly, that when they are so put a majority find them acceptable. The importance of these two facts is that between them they blow away a whole fog of "reasons for the decline of religion" which are often advanced and often believed. If the younger generation have never been told what the Christians say and never heard any arguments in defence of it, then their agnosticism or indifference is fully explained. . . . There is nothing in the nature of the younger generation which incapacitates them for receiving Christianity. If any one is prepared to tell them, they are apparently ready to hear.' It should be added that full summaries of the author's addresses and arguments are given in the book, and they are intensely interesting and suggestive.

Wells' Last Book.

Dr. P. Carnegie Simpson feels that *Mind at the End of Its Tether* has not received the attention which it should have done and which its author meant it to receive. Writing of it in 'The British Weekly' he reminds readers that Wells himself said of it that 'so far as fundamentals go' he would not have 'anything more to say.' In his earlier writings Wells was an idealist and even a visionary in his hopes for humanity. 'But what is his view of man and man's world in this last testament,' asks Dr. Simpson. In Wells' own words any 'optimism' as to the future must, 'in face of our universal inadequacy,' give place to 'a stoical cynicism.' There is 'no pattern of things to come'; instead we have 'the outline of the more and more jumbled movie on the screen before us.' Our world is 'like a convoy lost in darkness on an unknown rocky coast, with quarrelling pirates in the chart-room and savages clambering up the sides of the ships to plunder and do evil as the whim may take them.'

Dr. Simpson asks: 'Does it mean that even Wells himself was, in the end, forced to see that the gospel of secular science, in which he had placed such hopes, is not able to save the world? No doubt, he would add that, equally, nothing else can; but, certainly, *that* cannot do it, against the implacability of the Cosmic Power, the meaningless jumble of things, and the inadequacy and exhaustion of man in a world with no recuperative power. If this or anything like this is what it means—and certainly it is more than suggested—it is, at least, a tribute to Wells' intellectual honesty that, as he had long denied and even derided the gospel which relies on God and revealed religion, so now he discounts and even discards the gospel which relies on man and secular science.

'But I do not wish to put the point controversially; I put it enquiringly.'

Printed in Scotland by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.